AN

APOLOGY

FOR THE

Church HISTORY

OF

ENGLAND, &c.

BRITISH MUSEUM

AN APOLOGY FOR THE Church HISTORY OF ENGLAND,

From 1500 till 1688. Printed in the Year 1737.

BEING

A REPLY to a Quarrelsome LIBEL,

INTITL'D

A Specimen of Amendments, &c.

Under the fictitious Name of

CLEROPHILUS ALETHES.

Lingua tua concinnabat dolos: sedens adversus fratrem tuum loquebaris; et adversus filium matris tuæ ponebas scandalum. Hæc feciſti, et tacui. Exiſtimaſti iniquè quòd ero tui ſimilis. Arguam te, et ſtatuam contra faciem tuam. Pſal. xlix. v. 19. 20. 21.

Thy tongue forged guile. Sitting thou did'ſt ſpeak againſt thy brother; and againſt thy mother's ſon thou did'ſt lay a ſcandal. Theſe things thou did'ſt, and I ſaid nothing. Thou did'ſt wrongfully imagine, that I would be ſuch a one as thy ſelf. I will reprove thee, and do it to thy face.

Printed in the Year, MDCCXLII.

159

BRITISH MUSEUM

INTRODUCTION.

THO' *a great many Perſons, of remarkable piety and learning, were for ſome time of opinion, that an* Apology *was unneceſſary upon the preſent occaſion, where the* Hiſtory *was able to defend it ſelf, and the very countenance of the* Specimen *betray'd guilt: yet, upon ſecond thoughts, conſidering, that peace was not to be purchas'd at ſo dear a rate, where not only the reputation of the* Author, *and of ſeveral Noblemen and Gentlemen, of the beſt character, was virulently attack'd, and a work of the beſt tendency traduced with all the tokens of malice, they were prevail'd with to alter their opinion; and with the* Author *to publiſh a* Reply: *wherein, tho' he think's himſelf obliged to do juſtice both to himſelf, and to his performance, yet he is far from pleading an exemption from the common frailties of nature; but hope's to be indulged on thoſe ac-*

counts by all, that are friends to mankind. For they cannot give a better inſtance of their good diſpoſitions, than by granting ſuch allowances; eſpecially as to the various miſtakes, that may happen in life.

While the Author *was pleaſing himſelf with theſe thoughts, and the ſucceſs his labours met with from the approbation of ſufficient judges, he had conceived great hopes, that nothing would appear by way of oppoſition, eſpecially from a* Catholick *hand; when, to the ſurprize and ſcandal of all, that were ſtudious of peace, a virulent* pamphlet *creep's out of the preſs, of an invidious aſpect, in an angry ſtile, and with a form'd deſign to throw down the whole fabrick, and bury the* Catholick *intereſt under the ruins: and all this in a tranſport of zeal to ſupport the reputation of ſome of his* pragmatical brethren. *A* Libel, *I ſay, of ſuch a compoſition, as was only capable of impoſing upon the ignorant, or ſuch as were habitually inclined to be deceived. Had the* Libeller *contented himſelf with perſonal reflections; had he propoſed his pretended amendments with decency and a ſpirit of charity, as became his character; had he aim'd at no more, than to ſhew, the* Author *was unequal to his taſk; had he ſtopp'd here; tis probable, his impertinence would have been diſregarded; and way been given to his anger; leaving the* Hiſtory *to ſhare the fate of all other performances, that are expoſed to the cenſure of the world. But obſerving, from the complexion of the* Specimen, *and from many glaring inſtances, that he aim-*

ed

ed at a great deal more: that his deſign was to ſtigmatize the History, *and render it odious to* Catholicks, *for whoſe inſtruction and edification it was chiefly publiſh'd; that he threw about calumnies with ſo undiſtinguiſhing a hand, that perſons of the beſt characters did not eſcape him: the moſt trivial matters were ſhamefully exaggerated, and every dubious expreſſion ſo tortur'd, that by miſconſtruction he forced it always to confeſs* guilty *in the worſt ſenſe: When it was obſerved, as I ſaid, not only that theſe and ſuch like prevarications were frequent, but that the whole was a rhapſody of moſt injurious reflexions and calumnies, not only againſt the* Author, *but againſt all the Superiors and eminent Clergymen, who, both now and in former times, had diſtinguiſh'd themſelves by their virtue, and learning: When his cenſures, and calumnies were levelled not only againſt the undertaking, but againſt all that were diſpoſed to favour it; and with the greateſt indignity treated the chief of the catholick nobility, and gentlemen of the beſt characters, who had generouſly, and religiouſly contributed towards the publiſhing of the work: When this was the caſe, it was a juſtice due to the common cauſe, that engaged the* Author *of the Hiſtory to make a reply; and leave a farther chaſtiſement to thoſe who have authority to repreſs the inſolence of ſo notorious a* Libeller. *However, it will be requiſite, before I proceed any farther, to remove ſome obſtacles, that may hinder the* reader *from forming a true judgment of matters. If he happen's to be a perſon, who has read only*

the Specimen; *he will not be able to conquer the prejudices, he labour's under from the frightful idea the* Libeller *has given of the Hiſtory. This, I apprehend, may be the caſe of great numbers, who may be truly look'd upon as ſtrangers to the* Hiſtory. *Some are not in circumſtances to purchaſe ſo expenſive a work: others, I hear from good hands, are not only adviſed not to peruſe it, but deterred by threats from the peruſal; while the generality of the party, by a kind of* Hereditary Right, *take upon them to condemn every thing by the lump, that is diſapproved of by a* writer *of ſuppoſed merit and reputation. The misfortune a well-diſpoſed* Reader *may fall into by this implicit faith, without examining the merits of the cauſe, may, in a great meaſure, be prevented by taking a general view of the* plan *of the* Church Hiſtory; *and from thence judging, whether it is a work profitable to* Engliſh Catholicks; *or deſerving of that cenſure, the* Libeller *has paſs'd upon it.*

The Author's *deſign in general, was to publiſh a* Hiſtory *chiefly with regard to* Engliſh Catholicks; *and give ſuch an account of their affairs, as would reſpectively inform the ignorant, pleaſure the curious, and juſtify the whole body, as to thoſe popular aſperſions caſt upon them, ſince the firſt defection of this* Kingdom *from the communion of the See of* Rome. *This he effected with great labour, by collecting a vaſt number of proper materials, which before lay ſcattered about in ſmall Tracts, and private Manuſcripts: and, compriſing the whole in three volumes in* Folio;

Folio, *render'd 'em more uſeful to poſterity, and freed the curious from the inconvenience of a fatiguing ſearch. In favour of this undertaking it was his good fortune, to meet with a great many* original *Letters, and manuſcripts, which had never ſeen the light before, and contributed very much to give the world a better account of ſeveral tranſactions, where* Hiſtorians *had either been ſilent, or miſinform'd. In this regard, he was induſtrious in clearing all the matters of fact, which had ſo ſhamefully been miſrepreſented, to the prejudice of the* Engliſh Catholicks : *particularly concerning the pretended* Reformation; *which he plainly demonſtrated, cou'd not be a work approved by* GOD; *ſeeing that paſſion, ambition, intereſt, revenge, luſt, ſacrilege, cruelty, and all other worldly and vicious motives were viſible, and undiſguiſed in carrying it on. Then, to wipe off the aſperſion of ignorance, and immorality, which upon every occaſion was objected againſt* Engliſh Catholicks, *he give's a liſt of eminent men of that communion,* Clergy, Regulars, *and* Laymen, *with a ſummary account of their excellences, as a ſtanding and ocular diſproof of what they were charged with. Another inſtance of his labour and zeal in regard of* Engliſh Catholicks, *was upon the article of civil allegiance, or* Loyalty; *wherein they were miſrepreſented not only among the vulgar people, but even by the moſt celebrated* Proteſtant Hiſtorians; *who either through malice, or infatuation, were promoters and abettors of the ſame injurious opinion; and this the* Author *of the Church Hiſtory has ſo clearly confuted,*

futed, that there is no room for a reply. To theſe may be added the pains he has taken, to find out the ſecret ſprings of thoſe fictitious plots, wherewith the Catholicks *have been charged in every reign; and the ſucceſs he has had in confuting the inconſiſtent accounts, that were invented to ſupport 'em. He has had the ſame regard to the memory of thoſe, who were repreſented as* Criminals, *and infamous in the eye of the* Law: *and by exhibiting a liſt of ſuch as died for their* Religion, *with their tryals, and dying behaviour, has reſcued them from the imputation of* Rebellion; *and effectually proved, they had as clear a title to* Martyrdom, *as the primitive Chriſtians, who laid down their lives in the* Heatheniſh *perſecutions.*

This is the ſubſtance of the Author's *labours: and, conſidering how well the work is calculated for the publick good of* Religion, *and of* Engliſh Catholicks, *in particular; there never was a more ſurpriſing inſtance of* bigotry, *and partial zeal, than to find it attack'd in ſo furious a manner: and, if regard be had to the* Libeller's *character, and his motives to the attempt, it aggravate's the offence, and render's it highly criminal. He omitt's nothing, that he imagine's can either vilify the* Author, *or bring the performance into diſcredit. Every page of his* Specimen *diſcovers his deſign. And the better to prepare his Readers, to drink of the poiſonous cup, he has mingled for them, he paſſe's over, in an envious ſilence, all that the* Author *has performed toward, ſupporting the* Catholick *cauſe, and repreſent's*

the

the History, *from the beginning to the end, as obnoxious to cenſure, and fitter for the flames, than for the recommendation it has met with. How the* Libeller *will be able to acquit himſelf of the wretched task, he has undertaken, will appear when particulars come to be diſcuſſed. Mean time it will not be unſeaſonable to give the* Reader *a Sketch of thoſe terrible accuſations, that are brought againſt the* Author.

He introduces his charge by telling the world, that the writer of the Church Hiſtory is not an Author, *but only a* Compiler: *that his work is not a* History, *but a collection of* Records: *yea rather a* Dictionary: *and, as one of his* learned *acquaintance, after much enquiry, inform'd him, it might as properly have the title of a* Poem. *After theſe ingenious criticiſms upon the* Writer, *and* Title, *he proceed's to the method of the* History; *and labour's to depreciate it from ſeveral weighty conſiderations; which he hope's all* Readers *will take notice of:* viz. *that the* Parts *are not diſpoſed according to the beſt order: that the* Writer *is ſometimes too long, ſometimes too ſhort in his accounts, and ſay's very little of ſome perſons: that he affect's the uſe of ſome particular words, and ſeem's to aim at fine ſentences: that he doe's not always attend to the propriety of a word, and uſe's the ſingular number inſtead of the plural: that he ſometimes ſneer's, and make's uſe of* innuendo's: *that he is guilty of ſeveral omiſſions as to perſons and occurrences, which might have been taken notice of: particularly, by not making*

making ſuch reflexions, as others wou'd have made, concerning ſeveral Jeſuits: *that his repetitions are diſagreable: that he is too partial to the* Clergy: *that he is wanting in reſpect to* Superiors: *that he is ſuppoſed to be Author of a Pamphlet, publiſhed about twenty-five years ago, which ſome look upon as ſcandalous: that he make's not uſe of the beſt* Writers: *in fine, that he is a very dry inſipid* Author.

Now, 'tis left to the determination of every Impartial Judge, *whether ſuch trifling exceptions, which make up the bulk of his accuſations, are a ſufficient ground to blaſt a work with the ſevereſt cenſures, and to endeavour to render it uſeleſs for all the good purpoſes, for which it was deſign'd, and which are viſibly promoted by the* Author. *By oppoſing ſuch an undertaking, the* Libeller *has declared himſelf a common enemy to all, that have any concern for the* Catholick *Cauſe; and deſervedly incurr'd, from all hands, the cenſure of raſhneſs, injuſtice, and ſcandal. The moderate men, of his own* Party *and profeſſion, candidly acknowledge the raſhneſs of the attempt, not only for depreciating ſo uſeful a labour, but for provoking perſons of the greateſt worth to riſe up in their own defence, and wipe off the aſperſions he has caſt upon 'em. As lovers of peace, they were highly ſcandalized, that a perſon of his character ſhould give occaſion to revive ſo many contentious matters, which the* Author *of the Hiſtory only mention's incidently, without making himſelf a party, by pronouncing*

ing upon the merits of the cauſe, any farther, than a bare exhibiting of Records, *which any* judicious *perſon will look upon as the moſt diſintereſted way of proceeding in an* Hiſtorian. *Theſe* Noblemen *and* Gentlemen *have a farther demand upon the Libeller, in point of reſtitution, as well as reparation of honour, as they have generouſly contributed conſiderable ſums, towards carrying on a work, which was ſo well contrived for the benefit of* Engliſh Catholicks, *that it was not capable of being miſrepreſented, had not ignorance, malice, and bigotry enter'd into a combination to attack it, and to evacuate the good effects, it had already produced, with a farther view of doing more miſchief, as far as intereſt, power, or perſwaſion cou'd prevail, to hinder the ſale of the work for the future. I don't queſtion, but the* Libeller *may find* Caſuiſts, *that will juſtify ſuch a behaviour. But perhaps the perſons injured have a better notion of* right *and* wrong, *than to be tried by ſuch* Judges. *The ſcandal is no leſs with regard to well-diſpoſed* Catholicks *in every ſtation of life, who were ſurpriſed, and moved with indignation at the* Libeller's *attempt. They had read the* Hiſtory *with ſingular pleaſure, and edification: It filled their minds with comfortable* Ideas *of thoſe worthy perſons, who had formerly maintain'd the* Catholick *cauſe by their virtue, learning, and ſufferings. They never ſuſpected, they ſhou'd be diſturb'd with* idle ſpecimens, *and dreams of a* bigoted *brother, eaten up with the* zeal *of his houſe, and endeavouring to ruin the reputation of ſo uſeful*

uſeful a work, by ſhuffling the cards, and playing a falſe game upon his Readers. *There is no room for that celebrated motto,* ad majorem Dei gloriam, *when a writer preferr's domeſtick intereſt to the common cauſe; and ſacrifice's every thing to that darling paſſion. Such a behaviour is odious, and ſcandalous: we cannot equivocate with the* Almighty. *He know's, when we ſeek his glory, and when our own. The* Author *of the Hiſtory cou'd have no other view, but the cauſe of* God, *and his* Church. *The* Libeller *is wholly employed in maintaining the intereſt, not of his* Body, *but of a few of his* pragmatical brethren. *By this method, like a* Hireling, *he deſert's the camp of the* Lord; *and, for the lucre of* domeſtick fame, *take's part with the* enemy; *lead's them up to the attack; and encourage's them to fall upon the* Church Hiſtory, *who will not fail to give it the ſame character the* Libeller *has done; and thereby give a handle to weaken a cauſe, which is too well ſupported to be deſtroyed, notwithſtanding the* Libeller's *ſcandalous endeavours to effect it. I might add ſeveral other conſiderations, which will occaſionally find a place, when particulars are examin'd: but cannot omit one notorious piece of* forgery, *invented to ruin the reputation of the* Hiſtory. *The* Libeller *and ſeveral of his party, have induſtriouſly handed about a report, that the work is not a defence of the* Catholick cauſe, *but an* invective *againſt the* Jeſuits. *This I receive, not at ſecond hand, but from the immediate information of ſome, who always had a good opinion of the work hitherto, and deſign'd to be purchaſers,*

chaſers, but are kept off purely upon that idle report and miſrepreſentation. Thoſe, that have never read, nor deſign to read the Hiſtory, *if they have an implicit faith in the ſpreaders of this falſe report, may be reckoned among the* Incurables: *but 'tis to be hoped, they may have ſome* intervals, *and that the judicious part of mankind will not ſuffer 'em to lye long under ſuch a deluſion.*

From this general idea of the Libeller's Specimen, *any common Reader may be provided with a key, which will let him into the whole ſecret of his deſign, and diſcover the motives, that induced him to ſcatter about his calumnies. However, to ſatisfy perſons of more curioſity, I will deſcend to particulars, inſpect the* outward, *as well as the* inward *man, in order to make the deſcription compleat. This, perhaps, the* Libeller *will expect, as a piece of juſtice; leſt I ſhould ſeem to diſregard the merit of his ingenious remarks: for theſe are ſometimes a kind of recompenſe to the* Reader's *labour, who may take a pleaſure in the wit, where he expect's no ſolidity in the* rational way. *But I apprehend, there will be a diſappointment in both reſpects.*

AN

10 FE 60

AN APOLOGY, &c.

IN the first Place I will take the *Libeller* to task upon the following Heads:

1. Authors.
2. Partiality.
3. Omissions.
4. Characters.
5. Jesuits.
6. Respect to the See of *Rome*.
7. Pamphlets imputed to the Author.
8. Scandalous Comparisons.

AUTHORS.

I Am accused of neglecting good *Authors*, and making use of bad ones. This, and such like Accusations, being only in general

terms, deſtitute of proofs, deſerve no other anſwer, than a diſclaim in the ſame general terms. However, for the *Reader's* ſatisfaction, I will inform him of ſome particulars; what materials I made uſe of, and how I applied them. I thought it proper to diſtinguiſh *Authors*, what their general reputation was in matters of an indifferent nature, and how far their teſtimony would be allowed, where they were a party concern'd. This is ſo common, and neceſſary an obſervation, that 'tis ſurprizing, that a perſon, who ſeems to value himſelf for being a *Reader*, and *Writer*, ſhould give ſuch an inſtance, either of his ignorance, or his want of attention in the prudential choice of *Authors*. I know no *Hiſtorian* ſo good, (excepting the writers of the ſacred Hiſtory) that can bear the teſt in every reſpect; nor any *Hiſtorian* ſo bad, but may be read with ſome improvement. According to the difference of taſtes, opinions, inclinations, and principles, *Writers*, that are eſteem'd good by ſome, are reckon'd bad by others. In this variety of circumſtances and opinions, was not your cenſure raſh and unjuſt, to charge me with making uſe only of bad *Authors*; and hereby to impoſe upon the *Reader*, that the *Hiſtory* was unworthy of credit? I will not follow your method of blaſting *writers* and rejecting them, entirely, upon account of ſome particular defects. I will make no unbecoming reflections upon thoſe, you eſteem good *Authors*; but muſt take the liberty to obſerve, that tho' they

are good in your opinion and of thoſe of your party, they may not be ſo in the opinion of others: eſpecially this will not juſtify them in the account, they give of every particular fact. There is a mixture of good and bad in many eminent *Writers*. *Milton* has obtain'd immortal praiſe for his *Paradiſe Loſt*, tho' odious for his defence of King *Charles* the Firſt's death: *Buchanan* has acquir'd great fame by his poetry, tho' a baſe writer in other reſpects: *Arnaud* deſerve's commendation upon the article of the Bleſſed Sacrament, notwithſtanding his heterodoxy concerning *Grace*: *Mariana*, one of your Fathers, is eſteemed an excellent *Hiſtorian*, but has ſcandalized the Church by his *King-killing* doctrine: *Suarez*, another of your Fathers, is reckon'd a great maſter in the *metaphyſical* way; yet the learned Cardinal *Perron* tells us, he was the moſt ignorant divine he ever read in ſolid *eccleſiaſtical* matters. *Leſſius*, *Amicus*, *Eſcobar*, *Bauny*, *Sanchez*, *Azorius*, *Molina*, and a whole ſhoal of your *caſuiſtical writers*, tho' they have recommended themſelves upon ſome moral ſubjects, yet their ſcandalous aſſertions being condemn'd by the See of *Rome*, has ſhaken their reputation. I might add what the ſame *Cardinal* obſerve's in regard of your *authors* in general: That tho' they are very voluminous, and ſome of their works very valuable, yet, according to the opinion of the beſt *criticks*, they are in the main look'd upon as ſuperficial, and *bad writers*. This ob-

ſervation ought to make every one cautious in the choice, and uſe of *Authors*.

Now to apply it to our preſent purpoſe. *More*, *Bartoli*, and *Juvency*, whom you chiefly rely upon in your accounts, might be good and excellent *Authors* in ſome reſpects; *viz.* in extolling their order, and diſplaying the merits of ſeveral of their brethren, with ſingular eloquence; ſcrupulouſly exact in omitting no perſon, tho' never ſo obſcure: How he comply'd with the duties of his profeſſion, his behaviour in the church, in his cloſet and converſation, with many edifying reflexions for the *Reader*'s improvement, who will not queſtion the relator's veracity in ſuch matters, nor in any others, unleſs in controverted points, where caution is required. 'Tis foreign therefore to the matter in hand, what reputation your *Triumvirate* of writers may have in other reſpects. It may be more, or it may be leſs; but as to the controverſies between the *Clergy* and the *Jeſuits*, no impartial judge can think, they are *Authors* to be rely'd upon. In courts of *Judicature*, when a perſon is accuſed of high treaſon, the priſoner has the liberty to make his exceptions, and the wiſdom of the *Court* always looks upon it as a piece of juſtice, not to admit thoſe to be of the *Jury*, or witneſſes, who either have a form'd deſign to take away the priſoner's life, or are any ways intereſted in his proſecution. The caſe is not unlike, where the *Clergy* are impeach'd, and to be condemned upon the evidence of your *Triumvirate*; who upon many accounts are improper

proper witneſſes. Are they not, all three, *Jeſuits*, and may reaſonably be ſuppoſed to favour their own party? Are they not all *foreigners*; and, by conſequence ſtrangers to *Engliſh* affairs; excepting *More*, an *Author* of ſo poor a character, that one of your own Fathers aſſured me, he was of little account with thoſe of his order; as depending too much upon his old decay'd memory; which will plainly appear to thoſe that will be at the trouble of peruſing his *Hiſtory*; where undiſguiſed partiality and want of judgment are diſcoverable almoſt in every page; and a ſtrain of *Bigotry*, little leſs than *Enthuſiaſm*, when domeſtick merit calls him to the task. This is the weak foundation writers build upon, who copy their accounts from one another, and by an unparallell'd aſſurance claim belief, tho' they neither had, nor cou'd have authentick proofs to make good their allegations. Are theſe the *Authors*, I was obliged to follow in the *Church Hiſtory?* Where is the juſtice, to neglect *Writers* better qualified, and reject *original* letters out of a complement to your *Triumvirate?* Was I to omit nothing, that they were pleaſed to take notice of? or to tell my ſtory after the ſame manner? This, indeed, wou'd have been a ſure way of ingratiating my ſelf with the *Libeller*; and, if I miſtake not the caſe, wou'd at once have cancelled all the other pretended faults of the *Church Hiſtory*.

Theſe conſiderations lead me on, to weigh *Writers* by way of compariſon: and, upon enquiry, it will be found, that thoſe, I made

uſe of, were far ſuperior, both in dignity, learning, veracity, and all other qualifications, capable of eſtabliſhing their reputation. And for the *Reader*'s ſatisfaction I will mention ſome of them, *viz.*

Dr. *Lewis*, biſhop of *Caſſano*; ſometime vicar general to St. *Charles Borromeus*.

Dr. *Maurice Clenock*, formerly profeſſor of the civil law in *Oxford*, and biſhop elect at queen *Mary*'s deceaſe: afterwards made the firſt preſident of the *Engliſh* college at *Rome*.

Dr. *William Giffard*, archbiſhop of *Rheims*; ſometime theologal to St. *Charles Borromeus*.

Dr. *William Biſhop*; formerly agent at *Rome*, for the appealing clergy; where he was impriſon'd under the inſpection of father *Parſons*. He was afterwards made biſhop of *Chalcedon*: an eminent writer.

Dr. *Richard Smith*, biſhop of *Chalcedon*, formerly agent for the clergy in *Rome*, in the controverſies they had with father *Parſons* &c. an eminent writer.

Dr. *Matthew Kelliſon*; ſometime was chancellor of the univerſity of *Rheims*, afterwards preſident of the *Engliſh* college in *Doway*, an eminent profeſſor and writer.

George Birket, a venerable clergyman, who being made arch-prieſt, with the concurrence of his twelve aſſiſtants, vigorouſly oppoſed father *Parſons*, as appear's by their original letters in my hands.

Dr. *William Harriſon*, arch-prieſt; who with ſingular zeal redeem'd the clergy from the hardſhips

hardſhips they had lain under for many Years, and prepar'd the way for epiſcopal government.

Dr. *Cæſar Clement*, dean of St. *Gudules* in *Bruſſels*; appointed by orders from *Rome* to be a viſitor of the *Engliſh* college in *Doway*: which he gradually recovered from a very dejected ſtate.

Dr. *Anthony Champney*, fellow or *Socius* of the Houſe of *Sorbonne*: had ſeveral honourable employments among the clergy; agent at *Rome* to petition for epiſcopal government; vice-preſident of *Doway* college by the Pope's appointment; a long time priſoner in *England* for his faith, and ſent into baniſhment; for a while executed the office of arch-prieſt, and at laſt made dean of the chapter. He ſtrenuouſly aſſerted the liberties of the clergy in oppoſition to father *Parſons*, and was author of that learned work concerning Ordination againſt Mr. *Maſon*.

John Colleton, a venerable clergyman: impriſon'd, tryed for his life, together with *Campion*, and baniſh'd. He was the chief of the appealing Clergy, and publiſh'd ſeveral books in their behalf; and was the firſt dean of the chapter.

Dr. *Chriſtopher Bagſhaw*; cotemporary with father *Parſons* in *Oxford*; became a Catholick; and, returning into *England*, was a priſoner in *Wiſbich* caſtle. He was one of the appealing clergy, lived many years an ornament to his body, and by the *Benedictin* monks judg'd worthy of a mitre.

Theſe are ſome of the *Writers*, and the chief I made choice of, in the accounts I give in the hiſtory concerning the *Roman College*, *Doway College*, the arch-prieſt, *Wiſbich* diſturbances, &c. perſons, who lived in thoſe times; were eye witneſſes of, and continually remonſtrated againſt the hardſhips, the clergy underwent: Not a few *factious Prieſts*, as you ignorantly and unjuſtly repreſent the caſe: not perſons ſhut up in private walls; but of publick character; who had made themſelves famous in ſeveral univerſities, and diſtinguiſhed themſelves ſo by their merit, as to be rewarded with the higheſt dignities. What! is a *More*, a *Bartoli*, a *Juvency*, and ſuch obſcure perſons, to ſtand in competition with ſo many grave, and reverend writers, celebrated all over *Europe* for their learning and virtue? I appeal not only to their reputation, in general; but to their writings, manuſcripts, and letters; and even to the original letters of the adverſe *Party*; which are a convincing proof of a *Series* of attempts to the prejudice of the clergy: and leave it to any impartial *Judge*, whether any thing can be produced more deciſive in favour of the Church Hiſtory. Original writings, with hand and ſeal, are the laſt reſource in all debates.

PARTI-

PARTIALITY.

ANother of your general accuſations is; that notwithſtanding my diſclaim of *Partiality*, I am frequently guilty of offences of that kind. It would have been a ſtrange ſingularity in me, who knew myſelf innocent, not to make a diſclaim of *Partiality*, when all writers, whatever, take the liberty to make the ſame declaration. Exclamations on that head will do me no diſſervice; nor be regarded by perſons of penetration, and judgment, who are not to be carried away with noiſe and clamour; but by comparing cauſes, and diſcuſſing particulars, paſs cenſures accordingly. I am not ignorant that the word *Partiality*, in the common acceptation, is of a malignant nature, and import's ſeveral things to the prejudice of an *Author*; particularly when he favour's his own party, by unfair and unjuſt methods; as forging *Records*, perverting their genuine meaning, by fallacious arguments, and illegal inferences. Theſe are the rocks a great many ſplit upon; which I foreſaw, and avoided by employing skilful *Pilots*.

On the other hand, if I may be permitted to conſider the word *Partiality* in an innocent and more favourable ſenſe, as it implie's no more than an *Author*'s behaviour in favour of a party: 'tis a way of proceeding, which no one ought to be aſham'd of; but, on the contrary, all are obliged to, who deſign to be true to themſelves;

and

and the cauſe they eſpouſe. Is not every man ſuppoſed to talk and write in his own *character*? A chriſtian like a chriſtian, a catholick like a catholick; a clergyman like a clergyman; and a Jeſuit like a Jeſuit; and ſo reſpectively in every ſtation of life, where there are particular rights to be maintained, and cannot be maintained without making uſe of arguments, in favour of a party. You cannot charge me with *partiality* according to the common acceptation of the word, and as it tend's to the diſcredit of an *Author*; my cauſe is too well ſupported to be attacked in that way. If I am repreſented as only a favourer of a party, I allow the charge, and glory in it.

But now, my dear *Clerophilus*, ſuffer me to retaliate upon you, as to the article of *partiality*. In what ſenſe ſoever you are pleaſed to take it, your *Specimen* is one of the moſt flagrant pieces of *partiality* that ever appeared in publick. You come unprovided with proper *Records* to juſtify your allegations; you ſtifle thoſe I have laid before you; and examin not the force, and true meaning of ſome, you ſeem to have peruſed. Your arguments are fallacious; and the inferences, you draw from my words, illegal, and mere fictions of your own brain. The whole run of your *Pamphlet* is miſrepreſentation, and a form'd deſign to impoſe upon the ignorance and credulity of your readers. 'Tis a blundering compoſition of *crude Panegyricks* of perſons of your

your own party, who are remarkably eloquent upon the ſubject of ſelf-praiſe. Who are more partial, than thoſe, that are continually tiring their fellow-creatures with fulſome and nauſeous praiſes of their own *Authors*; and have not a word to ſpare upon the merits of others? Who are more partial, than they, who never ſpeak ill of themſelves, nor well of others; I mean, not with regard to their morals, but as to performances in *Literature*? Who are more partial, than they, who are ſtruck dumb at whatever appear's with applauſe from another hand, and endeavour to hide their partiality under the thin diſguiſe of an envious, and ill-natured ſilence? Who, in fine, are more partial, than they, who have depreciated, ſtigmatiz'd, and threaten'd with cenſures two of the moſt eminent *writers* in controverſy, and morality, that have maintain'd the cauſe of religion in this laſt century? Such are the dire effects of domeſtick views, which ſupported by emuloſity, endeavour to lay waſte the beſt of performances!

OMISSIONS.

THIS charge ſeem's to be an inexhauſtible fund of complaints. Did you expect, that I ſhould publiſh a Hiſtory of the whole world? Or that I ſhould omit no perſon, occurrence, or remark, that fell within my

my deſign? Such an undertaking, in the *Theory*, might be deſirable; but not practicable. Neceſſity and prudence obliged me to lay aſide ſuch thoughts. Sometimes I wanted ſufficient memoirs: The inſignificancy of ſeveral occurrences made me paſs 'em over in ſilence; and when I met with facts not well atteſted, I was too jealous of my reputation, as an *Hiſtorian*, to expoſe my ſelf to the cenſure of *credulity*. To repreſent this way of proceeding, as injurious to your ſociety, is an odd conſtruction put upon *omiſſions*. All the regular *orders*, nay even the clergy, and laity, may make the ſame complaint. Of every body of men ſeveral have eſcaped my induſtry; but without any thoughts of injuring the memory of thoſe, that were not taken notice of. Why was ſuch a perſon left out, who deſerv'd to be remembered? Why was not ſuch a reflection made to the honour of your *ſociety*? Why were not more particulars given of another perſon, remarkable for his virtue? Why did I forget to inſert ſeveral things, that I might have found in *More*, *Bartoli*, *Juvency*, *&c*? So many why's are ſo many inſtances, not only of want of judgment; but of want even of common underſtanding. Is it not manifeſt from the *plan* of the *Church Hiſtory*, that I never deſigned to deſcend to ſo many particulars; but only to epitomize the beſt qualifications of thoſe perſons I gave an account of? There is not the ſame reaſon to expect particulars from an *Hiſtorian*, as from a profeſs'd *Biographer*.

ographer. A writer of lives is confin'd to his man: an *Hiſtorian* move's in a larger ſphere, and only incidently mention's things, which ſome are deſirous of being more fully inform'd of. It was not to my purpoſe to ſtop the *Reader*, and acquaint him, what *prognoſticks* from his childhood foretold, that ſuch a perſon would be a great man: What *Saint* he choſe for his patron: How great an affection he had for your ſociety: What journeys he took to this, or that place of devotion: What pious ejaculations he ſent forth upon thoſe occaſions: What number of prayers he daily repeated, or how often he proſtrated himſelf upon the ground. For, tho' theſe, and ſuch like, are all edifying circumſtances; yet I contented myſelf, as an *Hiſtorian*, not to dwell upon them, but only to give a ſummary account of the beſt part of every one's character. And if, ſometimes, I ſaid no more, than that they were *Martyrs* (and it often happened, for want of records, that I could ſay no more) the title of a martyr is ſo comprehenſive, and big with merit, that the omiſſion of particulars is no abatement, much leſs an injury to the character. If any farther apology is required on account of *omiſſions*, I deſire the *reader* will obſerve what I have ſaid relating to that ſubject in the preface to the hiſtory, where I acquaint him thus: p. x.

'I am told, That, after all the ſearch I 'have made, the work will ſtill be imperfect; 'and many perſons left out, who have a right

'to

'to be remember'd. I own myſelf affected 'by this admonition: But it is not in my 'power to pleaſure perſons of ſo vaſt an ex-'pectation. If what I have done will prove a 'handſome attempt, and an inducement to 'better performers, it is the utmoſt of my 'ambition. I am willing to ſit down in the 'uſual poſture of a *projector*; to be improved 'and built upon by *poſterity*. However, if I 'am to be charged with unvoluntary omiſ-'ſions, ſo far I own myſelf guilty. For the 'truth is, it may perhaps be my misfortune 'not to anſwer the expectations of ſome ſorts 'of perſons, whoſe merits, for want of more 'intelligence, may not be ſufficiently taken 'notice of. But as this was entirely owing to 'their prudence in refuſing it, I may venture 'to make mention of it by way of excuſe. 'Yet I flatter myſelf, that I have done them 'juſtice, in many particulars, to which they 'themſelves were ſtrangers. And as their *fore-'fathers* have been eminently ſerviceable to 'the common cauſe by their virtue and learn-'ing; ſo I have related ſome paſſages, that 'will add a luſtre to their characters; and if 'I have related no more, they alone are an-'ſwerable for that deficiency.'

After theſe inſinuations, any one would imagine, *Clerophilus*, that you never read this part of my preface. That you did not attend to it, is pretty plain; it would have cured all your pretended ſcruples concerning *omiſſions*, and fully anſwered all the other general exceptions, that

that could be made againſt the *hiſtory*. This would have freed you from the labour of your wretched *ſpecimen*, and me from the needleſs complement of a *reply*. However, if you find yourſelf diſpoſed, to add to what is done by way of ſupplement, and pleaſure the world with edifying reflections, account of miracles, *&c.* you will very much oblige me. And I don't queſtion, but if your induſtry be anſwerable to your credulity, you may make my work compleat with an addition of three volumes more. As for materials for your purpoſe, your own *writers*, and ſome traditionary accounts, you abound with, can never be wanting to propagate your domeſtick reputation.

CHARACTERS.

WHAT you have invented, to charge me with, upon this ſubject, is, that *I have given a bad* character *of ſeveral perſons of eminent virtue*; and from hence you infer, that I am guilty of a breach of *charity* towards my neighbour. But in this, as in moſt other things, you miſ-repreſent the caſe, and will not allow me the liberty, that the moſt cautious *hiſtorians* take in delivering their minds upon ſuch occaſions. Had you attended to the obſervations, I made in my *preface*, it would have taken out the ſting of your ſcandalous imputation, and made you a better judge of

of ſuch matters: eſpecially had you conſider'd what I ſay Vol. II. of the Hiſtory, p. 404, *viz.*

'That the very beſt of men have, in all 'ages, been accuſtomed to oppoſe one another, 'where perſonal and domeſtick intereſt was 'concerned. Providence frequently order's mat-'ters thus, for our improvement in virtue; and 'the church, in general is often inſtructed and 'a gainer by ſuch kind of controverſies. There 'were diſſenſions amongſt the *Apoſtles* them-'ſelves, and the converſion of nations was the 'effect of their ſeparation. How many religious 'foundations have taken their riſe from pri-'vate animoſities? The occaſion was human, 'but the effect divine: when contending parties 'keep within the juſt bounds of a defence, they 'rather edify, than give ſcandal. 'Tis not my 'intention, at preſent, to pronounce upon the 'claims of perſons of different intereſts, but 'to reconcile their character in the main, and 'give allowance to miſtaken zeal.

This is the *compaſs* I ſteer'd by, when I had occaſion to mention thoſe perſons, whom you pretend I have injur'd in their character. But to prevent any miſtake from a wrong under-ſtanding of the *Word*, it will be requiſite to diſtinguiſh two ſorts of *Characters*; the one *Moral*, the other *Political*. Moral views are the ſame in all chriſtian ſocieties; but there is a difference in their domeſtick views, where a great many *Politick* games are often played, without any detriment to *morals*. 'Tis a true, and general obſervation, that perſons, irrepro-vable as to their moral *Character*, may be

juſtly arraign'd for *miſbehaviour*, in regard of other matters, both as to opinions and facts. Is it any detriment to a perſon's moral *Character*, to be ſubject to the common infirmities to which the greateſt ſaints were obnoxious; as ignorance, ſurpriſe, miſinformation, or miſtaken zeal? which ſometimes precipitate them to cenſure innocence under oppreſſion. Did St. *Peter* ſuffer in his moral character, as he is repreſented by St. *Jerome* making uſe of a kind of diſſimulation, when upon ſome occaſions he preſs'd a conformity to the *Jewiſh* ceremonies, and diſcountenanced it upon other occaſions? Did St. *Paul* ſuffer in his moral character, when he reproach'd the head of the church with miſbehaviour on that account? Did not ſeveral biſhops of the eaſtern church, who ſtand in the catalogue of *Saints*, oppoſe the ſee of *Rome* in the grand *Paſchal* controverſy? And did they loſe their moral character by that oppoſition, tho' they withſtood his Holineſs, even to threats of excommunication? Does not St. *Auguſtin* excuſe St. *Cyprian*, who vigorouſly oppoſed the biſhop of *Rome*, not in a trivial matter, but in an opinion, which was afterwards declared to be *Heretical*? If theſe great ſaints cou'd preſerve their moral character in the midſt of ſo much contention, and in matters of ſuch high concern, and yet be cenſurable for miſbehaviour on other accounts; how am I injurious to the character of thoſe buſy men of your ſociety, in their attempts againſt the honour and intereſt of the clergy? Is it not a ſufficient indi-

cation, that my intention is to favour them; when I leave room for ignorance, ſurpriſe, miſinformation, miſtaken zeal, and ſuch motives to plead in their favour, as the ſaints themſelves are obliged to have recourſe to, by way of excuſe, and to maintain their moral *Character*? And are not you obliged to follow the ſame method, in ſupporting the moral reputation of thoſe illuſtrious *Clergymen*, who appeared at the head of the cauſe againſt you? Theſe allowances I am willing to make; not that I am under any obligation of defending the moral *Character* of every one, that oppoſed the clergy. Perſons of different Diſpoſitions are either employ'd, or employ themſelves upon ſuch occaſions. Some behave themſelves like prudent men, and good chriſtians; others give a looſe to their paſſions. Now if any one of your party has miſbehaved himſelf ſo, as to forfeit his moral character; I will not pay you that complement, as to make him either an angel or a ſaint. He may be ſome *Clerophilus*, or nameleſs ſcribbler, not worth taking notice of. But as for thoſe you eſteem men of remarkable probity, I will do 'em all the juſtice I can in order to blanch their character, and give them the liberty to plead the cauſe in their own words.

J. E.

JESUITS.

IT was not only a ſurpriſe, but a ſubject of the greateſt aſtoniſhment, when, beſides your virulent *Libel*, you had induſtriouſly ſpread a deceitful report, that my Performance was not a Hiſtory, to ſupport the Catholick cauſe, but an *Invective* againſt the *Jeſuits*; wherein I ſuppoſe you conſulted your *learned Friend*, who ſtiled it a *Poem*; yet with this difference in the miſrepreſentation, that one is an inſtance of down right *Stupidity*, the other an inſtance of fraud, malice, injuſtice, and whatever charge can be brought againſt a notorious Impoſtor. I am ſenſible, the ſcandalous aſperſion has had the deſired effect and influence on ſome ignorant perſons, who never imagin'd I could be guilty of ſuch a crime, or that one of your character, cou'd be author of ſuch a report. However, I dare ſo far preſume upon the *Reader's* judgment, and leave it to his determination, whether the Hiſtory does not convince you to be a ſcandalous Impoſtor, in the very page, where I have made mention of the eminent perſons of your order, with all the circumſtances capable of recommending them to the eſteem of mankind, both for virtue, and learning. And as for religious *Orders* in general, tho' you often inſinuate the diſregard I have for them, it has always been my firm belief, that the ſeveral orders, approved of by the ſee of *Rome*, were glorious arguments of the divine goodneſs, and

providential care, in raiſing perſons time after time, to diſtinguiſh themſelves not only by obſerving the law of nature, and divine poſitive laws, but by practiſing and exhorting others to embrace the evangelical Counſels of poverty, chaſtity, and obedience; and particularly St. *Ignatius*, the worthy founder of your order, appear'd in theſe latter days at the head of a number of zealous Teachers, as it were providentially raiſed up to attack the modern *Hereticks*, who attempted to throw down the walls of *Jeruſalem*, which they ſtrenuouſly defended by their piety, and learning. Now, tho' 'tis a duty incumbent upon me and every *Catholick*, to have an entire reſpect for your order; yet 'tis an unreaſonable expectation, to have the ſame regard to every particular member, conſidering the cenſures they often draw upon themſelves by their miſbehaviour. Yet ſuch is the infatuation or craft of certain perſons, that they either believe, or carry themſelves as if they believed, that a private member cou'd not be attack'd without injury to the whole body; and immediately cry out *fire, fire, the whole ſociety is in danger.* Something of this, indeed, may be found in natural *Bodies*, where the whole is affected by a pain in any part. The loſs of a legg, or an arm diſfigures the whole Body. But 'tis not the ſame with political Bodies: they ſuffer nothing by the miſbehaviour of particular members. I am not ignorant, that great privileges have very deſervedly been granted to ſeveral religious orders:

orders: but I never met with any of ſuch an import, as to ſuffer offenders to intrench themſelves ſo deeply in the merits of their order, as to ſkreen them from all cenſures. And if any one is ſo bigoted, as to entertain ſuch a thought; 'tis to be hoped, that the ſuperiors, who are guardians of ſuch privileges, will not think it proper to extend 'em to a notorious *Libeller*. As to what regard's myſelf in particular, concerning my being injurious to the *Jeſuits*, I don't find myſelf in the leaſt affected by the charge. Had I, with a certain *Pope*, called them a *meddling* people: Had I, with a great many judicious writers, repreſented them as a *cunning*, *intriguing*, *politick*, *powerful* ſociety of men; I don't queſtion, but it wou'd have been a crime in me, tho' they might hug themſelves, and be pleaſed with the character. But I purpoſely abſtain'd from all general reflections. What cou'd I do more to ſhew my reſpect for your *Order?*

Reſpect to the See of Rome.

DIſreſpect to the See of *Rome* is a well-choſen topick for your purpoſe. To have recourſe to Power, where there is a deficiency in the way of argument, has often been the method of thoſe, who deſign'd *oppreſſion*. What you ſeem to aim at, upon the preſent occaſion, is to repreſent me obnoxious to the cenſures of *Rome*; where you rightly judge, the intereſt of your party is ſo great, that you can-

not fail of carrying your cauſe. But I am too well guarded againſt ſuch an attack: there being not one inſtance, in the *Church Hiſtory*, intimating diſreſpect, much leſs diſobedience, to the *Holy See*. Now to ſtate the caſe fairly, it will not be unſeaſonable to obſerve: 'tis with the pen, as it is with the pencil. If a picture is not placed in a true light, it will appear to be nothing, but a confuſed mixture of colours; and ſometimes repreſenting a monſter, inſtead of a beautiful face. The ſame happen's in repreſentations of the pen; when by art, and malice an invidious turn is given to the beſt cauſe. By this method it frequently happen's, that *Miniſters* charged with mal-adminiſtration endeavour to ſkreen themſelves purely by the ſtrength of their commiſſion; and craftily repreſent remonſtrances againſt abuſes, as inſulting the power from whence they received their Commiſſion; and to prevent *complainants* from proceeding any farther, means are found to preclude the way to a true information, and cut off all correſpondence with the ſupreme power; where 'tis a difficult matter to have acceſs, much more to have the caſe truly ſtated: to ſay nothing of the ſmall intereſt perſons under oppreſſion find, when they are to contend with a *politick*, and powerful adverſary. I leave the reader to make what uſe he pleaſes of theſe obſervations; which perhaps may be properly apply'd upon ſome occurrences, he will meet with. Mean time I will proceed to examine your charge of diſreſpect towards the See of *Rome*; which chiefly

regard's the *Roman College*, the *Arch-prieſt*, and *Doway College*.

To begin with what relate's to the *Roman College*. It was erected for ſecular *Clergy*, and a ſuperior, one of their body, placed over it by his Holineſs. Some time after, ſeveral of the ſcholars, in a mutinous manner, ſign'd a paper of complaints againſt their ſuperior, preſented it to the cardinal protector, and by him to his *Holineſs*; who, having conſider'd the contents, declared the *Scholars* to be *diſobedient*, and *Rebellious*; with expreſs orders either to ſubmit to their ſuperior, or to depart the college. But they, inſtead of obeying, took a reſolution to forſake the houſe: and accordingly did; intending either to return into *England*, or diſpoſe of themſelves otherways. During this combuſtion, the mutinous *Scholars* apply'd themſelves to the *Jeſuits*; who proved their faſt friends; and matters were ſo repreſented to his Holineſs, that they agreed to return again to the college upon certain conditions; the chief whereof was, that a *Jeſuit* ſhou'd be their ſuperior, and the *clergyman* diſplaced: His Holineſs in the mean time, out of a tender compaſſion, rather chooſing to condeſcend to their ſtubborn temper, than that ſo many young men, otherwiſe of hopeful diſpoſitions, ſhou'd be thrown into the world to their utter ruin. It may well be ſuppoſed, that this new regulation, which firſt took it's riſe from faction, diſobedience, and contrivance, was not very pleaſing to Dr. *Lewis*, and other clergymen, who

had laboured ſo much, and been at ſo great an expence, for the firſt eſtabliſhment; or to Dr. *Allen*, then preſident of the *Engliſh* college at *Rheims* (fam'd for his moderation in all party-diſputes, and particularly for the reſpect he had for the *Jeſuits*) but rather that he ſhould exclaim againſt the Scholars for their ingratitude towards Dr. *Lewis*, and other perſons, their greateſt benefactors. However, the *Jeſuits* having a reputation for the education of youth, and the new regulation being eſtabliſhed by the Pope's orders, they were ſubmitted to in every reſpect, in hopes that things wou'd turn out well for the good of the *Engliſh* miſſion; and for ſome time, there was no viſible occaſion for complaints. But, after ſeveral years experience, it proved far otherwiſe. An education of clergymen under ſuperiors of a different order, and very different intereſt, was attended with ſo many inconveniences; and theſe inconveniences with ſo great abuſes, that the clergy found a daily decay, both as to intereſt, learning, authority, and likewiſe as to reputation, and many other advantages: all owing in a great meaſure to that *heterogeneous education*. Theſe conſiderations induced them to ſeek for a redreſs. Frequent Remonſtrances were made time after time, and preſented to his Holineſs to that purpoſe; which ſo far had their effect, that viſitations were appointed, and miſmanagements detected, both as to temporals and diſcipline. If ſuch remonſtrances can be ſo miſrepreſented, as to appear diſreſpectful and

injurious to the See of *Rome*, it can only be the invention of ſome falſe *Clerophilus*, who has given us many *Specimens* of ſuch kind of dealing. Doe's any one diſregard the power, he make's an appeal to? Is it any affront, to deſire abuſes may be inſpected and redreſſed? Can humble and ſubmiſſive remonſtrances be ſtil'd reflexions? Were any of thoſe *remonſtrators*, who ſo frequently appeared at *Rome*, to complain, and exhibit the grievances of the clergy, ever looked upon with an evil eye? On the contrary they were reſpected, and honour'd with the higheſt dignities. And when of late a *Remonſtrance* was drawn up in ſtronger terms, than ever yet appeared, concerning the miſmanagement of the *Roman College*; tho' (for prudential Reaſons of the See of *Rome*, we are not to pry into, but may be gueſſed at) it had not all the deſired effect; yet the *Agent* was not charged with diſreſpect, but treated as a worthy member of the Catholick church, and returned loaded with honours, and thought fit to preſide over *Jeſuits*, and placed in a much higher ſtation, than tutoring a few boys.

Another inſtance of the pretended diſreſpect, I ſhew to the See of *Rome*, is, concerning the inſtitution of an *Arch-Prieſt*. I remember to have read in ſeveral judicious *authors*, (who ſpeculated upon the management of *catholicks*, during the ſtruggles between them and the pretended reformers; and then turn'd their thoughts upon *Ireland)* that they applauded the zeal of thoſe, who took care to perpe-

tuate

tuate the *eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy*, to which they attributed the ſucceſs of the catholick cauſe in that kingdom; which, to this day, appear's by the great ſuperiority in number of the *catholicks* to thoſe of the pretended reformers: and that at the ſame time, they took notice of the misfortune of the catholicks in *England* in not having obſerved the ſame method, when no particular difficulties could ariſe to obſtruct it. When it was almoſt too late to retrieve this loſs, frequent applications were made to the See of *Rome*, that the catholicks of *England* might be put under the inſpection of one or more of the epiſcopal character. Many reaſons were alledged on both ſides the queſtion: and for ſome time father *Parſons*, in particular, alledged ſeveral ſtrong arguments for epiſcopal government: but on a ſudden he either projected, or fell into the ſcheme of an *Arch-Prieſt*; upon what views, I will not ſay: But, as it appear'd by ſeveral ſtratagems afterwards in favour of the *Jeſuits*, it ſeem'd, an *Arch-Prieſt* would be more manageable; eſpecially if he was promoted upon their nomination; as the caſe really was. This inſtitution, tho' acceptable to ſeveral clergymen abroad, who lived as it were under father *Parſons*'s eye, was not reliſhed by a great many of the moſt eminent miſſioners in *England*: The newneſs of the œconomy, in having a ſimple and undignified prieſt placed at the head of a national church; the eſtabliſhment being only by the *protector*'s *letter*, without

out any expreſs *Bull* or *Brief* of his Holineſs for that purpoſe; and the protector's letter ſeeming to go upon miſinformation. For theſe reaſons ſeveral eminent clergymen demurred for a while, and enter'd a proteſt, till they had inform'd themſelves, whether his Holineſs did approve of this new œconomy, and made an appeal to the ſame purpoſe. This ſo exaſperated the *Arch-Prieſt*, that he exclamed bitterly againſt the appealing clergy; charged them with diſobedience, and threatened them with eccleſiaſtical cenſures; till at laſt the conteſt ran ſo high, that they were treated as *ſchiſmaticks*, eſpecially by the *Jeſuits*; who were as zealous for the cauſe, as if it was their own, (as indeed it was their own) in ſo much that father *L*---, one of their ſociety, publiſhed a pamphlet, to prove that they were actually guilty of *ſchiſm*. Meantime Mr. *Colleton* and the reſt of the appellants, to wipe off the aſperſion, apply'd themſelves to ſome of the moſt learned divines in *France*; who declared, that they were neither guilty of *ſchiſm*, nor of any diſobedience to the See of *Rome*, till his Holineſs had pronounced upon the debate. Soon after, when the *Pope* had by a definitive ſentence confirm'd the *Cardinal's* conſtituent letters, the *appellants* ſubmitted, and an end was put to that controverſy. Afterwards, there happened another warm conteſt between the *Arch-Prieſt* and ſome principal men of the clergy, not concerning his power, but his adminiſtration. They accuſed him of illegal practices,

practices, contrary to the canons, and ſuſpending 'em without ſufficient intimation; tho' at the ſame time they ſubmitted to the cenſure *pendente lite*. During theſe conteſts the name of *appealing clergy* became odious at *Rome*; not upon account of their appeals and remonſtrances, but becauſe of the character, that was ſent up to the protector, that they kept a correſpondence with the miniſters of ſtate in *England*. Whether this was really fact; or by whom, or for what end ſuch an information was given; as it is variouſly reported, 'tis not my buſineſs to make any farther inquiry. However, 'tis certain the Pope was far from having an evil opinion of all the appellants upon that account. He was ſatisfied ſome of 'em were perſons of extraordinary merit, as it appeared ſoon afterwards, when he obliged the *Arch-Prieſt* to take them in to be his aſſiſtants, and counſellors; with a farther injunction to forbear, for the future, conſulting with the *Jeſuits* in the government of the clergy. This put an end to all the controverſies concerning the Arch-Prieſt, the *appealing* clergy having gained one great point, they aim'd at. Now 'tis left to the determination of any judicious perſon, whether I have ſhewn any diſreſpect to the See of *Rome*, in giving an authentick account of theſe matters, and approving of appeals, as far as they were ſubmiſſive remonſtrances to his Holineſs. Can there be a greater reſpect ſhewn to the See of *Rome*, than to deſire, that abuſes may be redreſſed by it's authority? On the

the other hand, can the *Libeller* give a greater proof of the diſregard he has for the publick good, and diſreſpect to his Holineſs, than not only to obſtruct ſo good a deſign, but to repreſent all endeavours towards it, as affronting and injurious? 'Tis an eaſy matter to diſcover upon whom the charge of diſreſpect will fall.

I will only mention one other inſtance of the pretended diſreſpect, I ſhew to the See of *Rome*. 'Tis in relation to the management of *Doway College*, whereby I am accuſed for quarrelling with the regulations made by the *Cardinal Protector*, and conſtructively by the *Pope*. A preſident was nominated, who was obliged to receive inſtructions from the *Jeſuits*: The ancient doctors, and profeſſors that were clergymen, could no longer claim a reſidence in the college; The ſcholars were ordered to frequent the *Jeſuit's* ſchools; no clergyman was ſuffer'd to be confeſſor to the ſcholars, but a *Jeſuit* entertain'd purpoſely for that office; no one was admitted to be a ſcholar, without a particular recommendation either from the ſuperior of the *Jeſuits*, or from the *Arch-Prieſt*, who was obliged to conſult with the *Jeſuits* in the affairs of the clergy. Father *Parſons*, being the principal perſon at *Rome* that concern'd himſelf in the *Engliſh* miſſion, theſe regulations were generally ſuppoſed to proceed originally from his inſtigation. There is no occaſion to obſerve, how much they tended towards the prejudice of the Clergy. However,

ſince

ſince they were approved of by the *Cardinal Protector*, the orders were obey'd. But the clergy, finding by experience, that they ſuffered daily more and more, in their reputation both as to learning, authority, and other qualifications, which formerly recommended them, remonſtrated againſt the inconveniences of thoſe new regulations, and followed the cauſe ſo cloſely, that the See of *Rome* at laſt thought it fit, to have the evils redreſſed: And by degrees, the *Jeſuit* confeſſor was diſmiſſed, the *Scholars* recall'd from the *Jeſuits* ſchools, clergymen appointed profeſſors, the preſident diſplaced; with an expreſs prohibition, that the *Jeſuits* ſhould meddle no more with the Affairs of the clergy. Now I leave the *reader* to judge, wherein I have offended againſt the reſpect, that is due to the See of *Rome*. Is it in giving a true relation of the fact? Is there any diſreſpect in approving of remonſtrances againſt inconveniences and abuſes? If, to content and quiet a number of mutinous ſchool-boys, one of your body was made ſuperior of our college, and it is become viſible, that by means of that one, the whole revenue of the college, ſo ample and ſo magnificent, is applied to the uſe and advantage of your body, ſo that we have either no ſupplies of clergymen from it, or as good as none: Can it be term'd want of reſpect to his Holineſs, to regret this, as a vaſt prejudice to the clergy, and worthy his conſideration? If the See of *Rome* either has judg'd it proper,

proper, to have matters redreſs'd, or ſhall do ſo hereafter: Why am I charged with diſreſpect, for approving of what has been, or ſhall be done in thoſe caſes?

Pamphlets imputed to me.

UPON reading your remarks concerning certain *Pamphlets*, I was at a loſs to know your deſign, or what uſe you could make of them to your preſent purpoſe. One while I imagined, your intention was only to vilify me, by repreſenting me as the author of thoſe pieces, which you look'd upon as ſcandalous. But I endeavoured to ſtifle this ſuggeſtion, for ſeveral conſiderations. I had a better opinion of your judgment, than to think, you would go upon conjectures in ſo heavy a charge. Again; I could ſcarce perſwade myſelf, that a perſon of your character, and ſo zealous a diſciple of St. *Ignatius*, could be guilty of an aſperſion, which, as you repreſent the matter, could amount to no leſs, than publick *defamation*. Another while it came into my mind, that perhaps the repreſenting of me, as the author of thoſe pamphlets, would be a means to diſcredit the *Church Hiſtory*, or any other performance, that came from the ſame hand. And, tho' this is one thing, you expreſly aim at, yet I was unwilling to believe, it was your real opinion; or that it could be any way ſerviceable

viceable to your cauſe; as being a method as much contrary to good reaſoning, as the other was to juſtice, and charity. If a writer has deviated from truth in ſome of his performances, is he to be charged with falſities in whatever he publiſhe's afterwards? Is there any *Hiſtorian* able to ſtand the teſt of ſuch a raſh, and general cenſure? I have given you many proofs to the contrary, even among your own writers; who have notoriouſly abuſed the world both by their falſe doctrine, and miſrepreſentations in matters of fact. Mean time, any judicious perſon will be of opinion, that whoever was the *Author* of thoſe *Pamphlets*, or whatever they may contain, they are foreign to your preſent purpoſe; whoſe buſineſs is only to attack the *Church Hiſtory*. Having entertained myſelf for ſome time with theſe, and ſuch like reflexions; at laſt I found out your treacherous contrivance; well invented to ſeduce ignorant readers. Being fully convinced within yourſelf, that the *Church Hiſtory* was out of your reach, and no other way to be attack'd, than by a few trifling and pedantick remarks, which could not touch it's reputation; a happy thought came into your mind, that about 25 years ago certain *Pamphlets* were publiſhed, which were more obnoxious to cenſure, than the *Church Hiſtory*: and upon a ſurmiſe, that they came from the ſame hand, your project was, artfully to mingle the cauſes, and join them together. According to this Scheme you publiſhed your *Specimen*; and the moſt material exceptions you

you make, are againſt theſe Pamphlets. Now tho' this indirect way of proceeding doe's not oblige me, to take any notice of what you alledge, either as to their Author, or to the contents (which ſhall be conſider'd in my reply to particulars) yet 'tis a juſtice due both to myſelf and to the reader, not to let you paſs without proper correction; but to charge you with being a notorious impoſtor in the account you give of thoſe Pamphlets. And, for inſtance, I will mention one, intituled, *monita ſecreta*, which I take to be the moſt ſcandalous, and you are pleaſed to make me author of. I am told by thoſe that have read it, that it is a pretended account of ſome *ſecret maxims* of government among the politick part of the *Jeſuits*, with many not too decent reflexions upon their order. How this *Book* came to be fixed upon me, I cannot divine. I never ſaw it but once; nor ever read a page in it, to the beſt of my remembrance. So great an averſion have I always had to thoſe books that reflected upon religious orders. But as providence is ſo kind as to find a way to detect impoſtors, it fortunately happen's on my account, that I was not in being, when this famous *Book* was firſt publiſhed: So that you cannot charge me with it, without making me guilty of a double *original* ſin; one natural, derived from *Adam*; the other artificial, by making me inherit the malice of all the ſcurrilous books that have been publiſhed againſt your order ever ſince it's firſt inſtitution. This is a *Specimen* of your veracity: and of the little credit

that is to be given to you, in what relate's to thoſe *Pamphlets*. It is upon this, and ſeveral other ſuch prevarications, that I may juſtly call you to an account, and try you by the teſt of your candour, ſincerity, veracity, and conſcience. You, who have made ſuch declarations againſt miſrepreſentations, and falſe accuſations; you, who ſeem'd diſpoſed to ask pardon wherever you had ſaid, or done amiſs: you, I ſay, who made ſuch ſolemn and plauſible proteſtations againſt injuries and injuſtice; how are you conſiſtent with yourſelf, or your behaviour reconcileable with juſtice and charity, when you aſperſe me with a calumny of the greateſt magnitude? All prudent *Readers* will think you obliged to anſwer their juſt expectations in this regard; and, inſtead of ſcurrilous *Specimens*, to employ your pen in a ſolid confutation of thoſe *Pamphlets* (which in the ſpace of 25 years you have never attempted to do) tho' your ſilence ſeem'd to imply a conſent. And when you have effected this to their ſatisfaction, you will have a farther task upon your hands, to prove me to be the *Author*. Meantime I muſt look upon you, as an *Inventor* of calumnies, and obliged to reparation; which I, as the perſon injured, do require from you.

Scandalous

Scandalous Compariſons.

THO' there is a great deal of variety in your *Specimen*, yet it all run's in the ſame *Key* of ſcandal: and, after repreſenting me as *Author* of ſcandalous books, to act coherently, you muſt, one way or other, place me on the liſt of ſcandalous writers: but I little expected, that your paſſion wou'd have hurried you on to ſuch an exceſs, as to compare me with the moſt profligate men, you cou'd pick out, and the moſt infamous for lying, impiety, and ſcandal. 'Tis an uſual obſervation, that *compariſons are odious*, as giving an occaſion to emuloſity, envy, and contention: but when they tend to the depreciating, and vilifying of a perſon's character, they are ſo ſhocking, as to be entirely irreconcileable either to decency, or to the common principles of Chriſtianity. Your behaviour towards me in this regard, (giving proper allowances to the parallel) is not unlike to that of the *Jews*, when they arraign'd our bleſſed *Saviour* with thieves, and murderers. *Saints* and *Martyrs* have often been obliged to hold up their hands, condemned and executed in the company of the moſt notorious villains. By ſuch proceedings the moſt innocent have fallen unpitied, and the vulgar been ſeduced by a falſe repreſentation to look upon them as equally criminal. I cannot ſay, but the method you have taken, is well adapted to the purpoſes of a *Libeller*, who gain's a great point, if

he can but fill the *Reader's* head with bad impreſſions. However, it will ſcarce be believed, that a perſon of your character, or indeed any one, that pretend's to be a Chriſtian, could be guilty of ſuch a contrivance: And I wiſh, it were as much in my power, to ward off the cenſures, you have deſervedly drawn upon you on this occaſion, as it is to vindicate my ſelf againſt your ſcandalous compariſons. The *writers* you are pleas'd to couple me with, are: *Burnet*, whom you look upon as a notorious impoſtor; *William de St. Amour*, a profeſſed enemy to religious vows; one *Watſon*, who aſperſed the *Jeſuits* with manifeſt calumnies. Now a bare peruſal of the *Church Hiſtory* is an ocular proof of the injuſtice, you have done me: and I may challenge the moſt prejudiced *reader* to find out one inſtance of a reſemblance. On the contrary, it will appear, that my main deſign is, to confute ſuch profligate writers. Do I not expreſsly, by name, attack *Burnet*, and overthrow the fallacious account, he give's of the pretended *Reformation*; and trace him, ſtep by ſtep, in my *hiſtory* in oppoſition to his? Is not the whole account, I give of *monaſteries* and other religious foundations, a plain proof, that there is no reſemblance between me and *St. Amour*? Do I not diſtinctly aſſert the lawfulneſs, and beneficial inſtitution of every religious order? Have I not wiped off the aſperſions caſt upon them, and deſcended ſo far to particulars, as to juſtify perſons of every order, even as to their private

private behaviour? As to *Watſon*, or any other, who have publiſhed ſcandalous reflexions upon the *Jeſuits*, I have diſclaimed them by name, as writers not fit to be followed, on account of their paſſionate invectives. This you know to be true, and expreſsly own it. Where then is the *reſemblance?* And how will you juſtify your ſcandalous *compariſon* in reckoning me among ſuch profeſſed enemies to virtue and religion? If there is no reſemblance in our principles, nor in our performances, as you cannot but acknowledge, why don't you ſpecify, wherein the reſemblance does conſiſt? If *Burnet* was an ingenious writer; if *St. Amour* was a profound divine; if *Watſon* was a zealous defender of the *clergy:* I ſhould not diſpute, but rather value myſelf for ſuch a reſemblance, tho' neither you intended it, nor I could lay claim to it. No, no, Sir: It was a difficult matter, to find out the reſemblance; and 'twas not your buſineſs to labour for it. You had done enough, by a general compariſon, to ſeduce *ignorant readers*; who would take no pains to efface the firſt *impreſſion*; nor would any arguments made uſe of, to undeceive them, obſtruct the effects of that pernicious maxim: *Calumniare fortiter; aliquid adhærebit. Lay on thick, ſomething will ſtick.*

A

REPLY to PARTICULARS;

Whereby the Writer of the Specimen *is occaſionally convicted of*

1. Ignorance,
2. Abſurdities,
3. Trifling,
4. Contradictions,
5. Pedantry,
6. Falſe Reaſoning and illegal Inferences,
7. Forgery,
8. Miſrepreſentations,
9. Bigotry,
10. Want of Charity,
11. Calumnies,
12. Contempt of men of worth, &c.

Title, A *Specimen.*

SPECIMENS have ſometimes their merit, when a writer is well qualified; but commonly many defects are diſcoverable in ſuch a method. Such writers commonly are only *Plunderers.* Like rats, they nibble here and there, without conſuming the goods, they ſeize upon: the eager appetite of ſuch miſchievous vermin goe's no farther than to deface the beauty of what they cannot devour. Thus puny *Criticks,* overlook the excellences of a performance, and exerciſe their low talents upon words, phraſes, omiſſions, and ſuch trifling matters. They leap from page to page, add, detract, and throw behind them every thing, that wou'd clear a debate. In a word, their endeavour is to hamſtring an *Author,*

Author, that they may purſue him with more eaſe, and make him more manageable. How well this deſcription ſuit's your *Specimen*, will ſoon appear.

Title

Amendments.

There was no occaſion to mention amendments. Had you been able to make out *one* breach, it wou'd have fully anſwer'd your purpoſe. Other matters, you quarrel with, are neither for your credit, nor any prejudice to the *Hiſtory*. The author of it ought rather to return you a letter of thanks, than a *Reply*; ſince moſt, who have read your *Specimen*, are more confirm'd in their good opinion of the Hiſtory.

Title

Compiler.

I remember formerly to have read a notable piece of ſatyr, publiſhed againſt *Natalis Alexander* the great divine and hiſtorian, by *P. F.* a *Clerophilus* of thoſe days. One of his keen remarks, was, to ſtile him not an *Author*, but a *Compiler*. If you beſtow that appellation upon me by way of *ſneer*, (which I ſcarce believe of one, who exclaim's ſo bitterly againſt *ſneering*) I have ſtill the comfort to be joined with good company, and am willing to undergo the ſame fate. As to the thing itſelf, it was never my fortune to meet with any criticiſm concerning the difference between an *Author*, and a *Compiler*. But according to my preſent way of thinking, it may be the ſame as between a maſter

maſter *Taylor* and a *Botcher*; and, upon application, thoſe writers that have publiſh'd facts, and curious tracts of eccleſiaſtical matters, muſt be content to be ſtil'd *Compilers* or *Botchers*; and thoſe only dignified with the title of *Authors*, who have work'd up their dreams in metaphyſical enquiries, and romantick deſcriptions. Theſe are the writers, you are ſo much delighted with; but for my part, I am not ambitious of purchaſing the title of an *Author* at ſuch an expence.

Title.

By Clerophilus.

It is obſerv'd by ſome, who are well skill'd in the *Hebrew* language (and it may be the ſame in the *Greek)* that names were commonly given expreſſing the properties of perſons and things. But I cannot think you had any intention, to rebaptize yourſelf, *Clerophilus*, in conformity to that cuſtom; there being nothing in your behaviour anſwerable to the ſignification of the word. If you paſs for a friend or ſon of the clergy, it muſt be underſtood of a *Backfriend*, and *illegitimate* ſon. Such a *Clerophilus* was that good father, who being conſulted about a pious legacy left to the *clergy*, by a dexterous turn in *Caſuiſtry* made the *Donor*'s will point at the *Regular Clergy*. However, thus far I agree with you; that you did not aſſume the name of *Clerophilus*, in order to conceal your perſon (a name ſo much celebrated amongſt, &c.) But that you aſſi m'd it, with a deſign of concealing your inclinations, and acting your part

part more undiſcovered under that mask, is plain from every page of your *Specimen*. This is what I more than ſuſpected: and therefore I have taken the pains to ſtrip you of your diſguiſe, diſcover the *wolf* in the *lamb's* skin, and prevent you from ſtealing a bleſſing from the *clergy* by *Jacob's* voice, and *Eſau's* hairy hands.

Preface.

'Tis high time to remedy the harm he has already done.

Had I not known your voice, I ſhould have judg'd it to be the complaint of *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Burnet*, &c. of the harm I had done to the cauſe of the pretended *Reformers* by a hiſtory expreſſly written in oppoſition to them. If by harm you mean only ſome imaginary evil, you apprehend, by having ſome of your *pragmatical brethren* call'd to account; I am ſorry to find you of ſuch a diſpoſition, as to prefer domeſtick intereſt to the common cauſe; and rather chooſe to ſacrifice the good of religion, than have one of your members cenſur'd for his miſbehaviour. If there is any ground for complaint of harm done, 'tis high time to look about you; or rather, the time is elaps'd. The *Hiſtory* has had a conſiderable run, and gain'd reputation for ſome years: whydid you fall aſleep ſo long upon the lumber of your collections? Was it want of zeal, or want of capacity; that occaſioned the delay? Were you not thrown into ſuch confuſion, that nothing could be reſolved upon? Were there not ſome troubleſome

paſſages

paſſages in the *Hiſtory*, which put you to a ſtand, how to extricate yourſelf? Did you not wait for orders, and a bleſſing upon the undertaking? Whether all, or only ſome of theſe motives occaſioned ſo long a ſilence, I will not determine. What you think proper to alledge by way of excuſe, is, that you wou'd not make the attack till the third volume appeared; in hopes, I ſuppoſe, of giving a general rout. But notwithſtanding that this was too late to remedy the pretended harm, that was already done (as the wiſeſt men cannot foreſee all things) you ought to have conſider'd, that, as the volumes increaſed in number, new difficulties might ſtart up; and ſuch, I believe, you will meet with in the third volume, as will deſtroy all hopes of ſucceſs.

Preface.

F. More, Bartoli, *and* Juvency *have been moſtly followed.*

I have given ſuch convincing proofs, why theſe writers are not to be rely'd upon, that no impartial judge will think it juſtice to admit them as evidences. One an *Italian*, another a *Frenchman*, ſtrangers to our affairs; the third, indeed, an *Engliſhman*, but of no reputation with thoſe of his own order. All three *Jeſuits*, and ſuſpected of partiality in facts, where their intereſt is concern'd. All unprovided with proper memoirs, contradicting original letters, and oppoſing writers of much greater credit: as I have ſhewn at large in my general reply.

Preface.

But if any ſhall reply to theſe remarks——— I ſhall ſcarce throw ſo much time away, as to tell them they have ſaid nothing to the purpoſe.

Very magiſterially ſpoken. You ſeem very much to overvalue your own performances, and make thoſe guilty of the greateſt preſumption, who dare attempt a reply. Thoſe you have to deal with, are not to be driven out of the field by ſuch threats. They will bring you to a ſtricter account, than telling them, *they have ſaid nothing to the purpoſe.* However, when a *Debtor* is inſolvent, the *Creditor* muſt be content upon any terms.

Page 3.

This is not mentioned to imply an odious compariſon between you, and thoſe ſtigmatized authors.

The compariſon itſelf, being odious, abuſive, and ſcandalous; it will be a difficult matter to excuſe you from an evil intention.

Page 3.

There are other ways of very grievouſly offending religious orders.

And are there not other ways of maintaining the reputation of *religious orders*, than by skreening every particular member from the cenſures, they juſtly deſerve?

Page 3.

It has, Sir, been very generally ſuppoſed, that you was the author of certain pamphlets.

Suppoſitions, conjectures, and vulgar reports, will never paſs with perſons of good underſtanding, or carry a cauſe in any court of *Judicature*; much leſs excuſe from raſh judgment, where the caſe is defamation. I have already diſcover'd your motives for dragging in thoſe *Pamphlets*; convicted you to be an *Impoſtor* in the imputation; and will occaſionally take notice of the weak grounds of your conjectures.

Page 4.

When thoſe Pamphlets appear'd, ſome were pleaſed to deſire I wou'd anſwer them.

Certainly there was a great ſcarcity of men of merit, when *Clerophilus* was call'd upon, from the frozen zone, to defend the cauſe. But this may eaſily be accounted for, when we conſider the general complaint of a famine, for near a century, under a certain *Latitude*. Were it either to my preſent purpoſe, or to your's, to dwell upon thoſe *Pamphlets*, I would take the liberty to ask you a few queſtions. How came you o refuſe the undertaking? Why a ſilence of 25 years? 'Tis a long time to lye under ſuch terrible accuſations. What you alledge is not ſatisfactory. Cou'd you expect, the *Author* would repent, and recant, if neither his own conſcience accuſed him, nor you ever ſo much as made an attempt, to convice him of his errors? If the inſignificancy, and contempt of the work made you drop the cauſe; you have alter'd your opinion, and attack it now as a formidable enemy, in your *Specimen*, tho' foreign

reign to your deſign of only propoſing *amendments* to the Church Hiſtory. But whatever your motives were for your different behaviour in regard of thoſe *Pamphlets*; I find, many have another way of thinking; and ſuſpect, that the cruſt being too hard for your teeth, and the deſign of procuring a cenſure from *Rome*, being diſappointed, you content yourſelf with mumbling and gnawing every corner, without any hopes of ſucceſs.

Page 6.

I can aſſure you, that if any Jeſuit *had run into the like ways of injuring the Clergy, the ſuperiors of the ſociety would oblige him to make a publick ſatisfaction.*

I hope, my dear *Clerophilus*, you will excuſe me, in not accepting of your ſecurity; and tho' it is offered in a magiſterial manner; yet I do expect to be heard in my turn; and at the ſame time do not only aſſure you, but will prove, that your proteſtation is contrary to juſtice, injurious to the clergy, and, by a juſt retaliation, will be no credit to thoſe, upon whom the cenſure muſt fall. I am obliged to make publick ſatisfaction. Satisfaction! For what? It muſt be for ſome crime. Where is the crime in repreſenting any body of men, induſtrious in propagating their domeſtick intereſt? Do not all *Societies* employ their labours to this purpoſe? Where is the crime in taxing particular perſons with misbehaviour, who make uſe of unfair and unjuſt methods? Are not all ſuperiors obliged to deſert them upon ſuch occaſions? Is there any thing in my Hiſtory, that does not

fall under theſe two conſiderations, and goes no farther? If my *Superiors* don't call upon me to make ſatisfaction, either they don't think me obliged to it, or you aſperſe them with being wanting to their duty. On the other hand, how dare you mention your ſuperiors, as an example to be followed on ſuch occaſions? 'Tis well known, how many injuries you have done to the *Clergy*, both in converſation, and publick libels. Did you ever make ſatisfaction for them? 'Tis notorious, when, where, and by whom *Doway* college, the *Biſhops*, and the *Clergy* in *England* were charged with *Janſeniſm*; and tho' they were honourably acquitted by the ſee of *Rome*, did the Accuſers ever make any ſatisfaction? Ah *Clerophilus!* I am afraid, that you, and ſome of your party, do ſtill feed upon the dregs of that calumny, and ſilently murmur at the diſappointment.

Page 7.

Amendments are requiſite almoſt in every page of your work.

This it is to fall under the hands of an unmerciful critick. *Huſſars* ſeldom give any quarter. But I am in hopes, 'tis only one of your random ſhots, and may not do much execution. Every reader, tho' ſhort-ſighted, will not make uſe of a *multiplying glaſs*.

Page 7.

The fair proteſtations you had made to others, and to me in particular, of being impartial.

'Tis cuſtomary with all writers to make ſuch proteſtations, as well as a piece of juſtice, the world expect's from them. But why I ſhould

addreſs myſelf to you in particular, is ſomewhat unaccountable. There was no poſſibility of removing thoſe prejudices, which were ſo deeply rooted in your mind, and hinder'd you from entertaining any other *Idea* of the work, than what was ſuitable to the habitual inclinations of a bigoted reader, haunted with fears, and jealouſies of partiality. But to be plain with you, this pretended proteſtation, as it relate's to you, is all a fiction.

Page 8.

That, in the following parts you gave the Jeſuits *their own.*

'Tis not material to enquire after the reporter of this expreſſion. The words, indeed, in common uſage import *threats*; but not always *injuſtice*; eſpecially, if perſons deſerve a reproof.

Page 8.

Upon this, notice was ſent, as I am very ſure, to a Perſon of proper authority, deſiring he would uſe his beſt endeavours to hinder you from publiſhing the following parts, till they had been carefully reviſed by ſome impartial men.

I commend your care in providing for your ſafety, upon the report of an invaſion. Power will prevail more, than arguments, in many caſes. As for the perſon of *proper authority*, you made your application to, his authority, was either *Juridical*, or only *Perſwaſive*. If *Juridical* he did not think it convenient to make uſe of his power. If only *Perſwaſive*, 'tis probable he had many good reaſons not to complement you with a ſuppreſſion of the work. As for *Impartial Reviſors*, where was he to look for

them? In the moon? If by *impartial men*, you mean fair *Dealers*, they may be found every where, having the liberty to give their own character. If you mean men of no *Party*, there are no ſuch perſons living, when they are put to the teſt in the controverſies of life. Humour, intereſt, education, and principles will oblige them to declare, and deſtroy the affected ſyſtem of neutrality. I cannot ſay how this perſon of *proper authority* behaved himſelf in the anſwers he gave. But I find by the iſſue, they only increaſed your fears.

Page 9.

It was with great concern that I undertook this ſpecimen.

You had no occaſion to be under any concern, for engaging in ſo glorious a cauſe; which, you ſay, juſtice obliged you to undertake. Yet you might be under a great concern, for reaſons, you are not willing to expreſs. Publiſhing not only a cenſorious, but *ſcandalous libel*, might, upon reflexion, give you a ſting of conſcience: The ill management of the cauſe might bring you into diſcredit with your ſuperiors: or perhaps your tender conſtitution dreaded the ſmart of a *reply*.

Page 9.

Some perſons have been very profuſe in giving vaſt commendations of your work.----- They could not be given, but by men of ſtrong prejudices, or weak judgments.

This is the character you give of thoſe *noblemen*, and *gentlemen*, who were pleas'd to contribute to, and approve of my labours; but it

is both falſe and abuſive to the laſt degree. Their approved merits, both as to their private, and publick character, has placed them out of the reach of any ſaucy pen. All your own friends can tell you, they never obſerv'd any of thoſe defects, you charge them with. Are they not reckoned among the moſt eminent *Engliſh* catholicks? and remarkable for virtue, and learning, and all other commendable qualifications? So circumſpect in their opinions, that they neither praiſe nor diſpraiſe by the lump, as ſome uſually do. They both read, underſtand, and conſider, before they paſs their cenſures. I will make no indecent reflexions upon thoſe worthy perſons, you imagine will patronize your cauſe; but muſt take the liberty to tell you, that in the opinion of very good judges, the greateſt part of your merit is lodged with the weaker ſex, the ignorant populace, and a number of bigoted diſciples, who are not yet wean'd from the teat, they have ſo long ſuck'd at; nor brought to feed upon more ſolid nouriſhment. If your ſuperiors are perſons of ſuch ſtrict juſtice, in point of reparation, as you repreſent them, they ought to make you an inſtance of their good diſpoſitions in that way, and give you the chaſtiſement you deſerve for traducing, and vilifying perſons of the greateſt worth.

Page 11.

Records; moſt of them either nothing to the purpoſe, or very eaſy to be met with in other Books, or very needleſsly copied at large, where a hint of them would be ſufficient.

The learned part of mankind have always put a value upon *Records:* But 'tis no wonder that your weak ſhoulders ſhould not be able to ſupport the weight. If they are originals, they have a murdering aſpect. So you do well to keep at a diſtance, leſt they ſhould ſtare you to death. I believe many of them are not to *your* purpoſe; tho' few, but what are to *the* purpoſe. If ſome of them are to be met with in other books, 'tis a proof the *Collector* was not an impoſtor; much leſs ought he to be reproach'd for his labour, in bringing them into a leſs compaſs. The moſt material records are originals; which never ſaw the light before. 'Tis what you apprehend from this attack, that give's you ſo much diſturbance about *records.* I am of your opinion, that hints would have been more agreeable to you, and to all ſuch ſuperficial writers: but perſons of penetration and ſound judgment, are deſirous to peruſe whole *records,* and *originals.* They not only ſwim, but dive to the bottom, who fiſh for treaſures.

Page 11.

How many of no farther uſe, than to inform us, ſuch perſons lived in one year, and died in another?

I have already acquainted you with the occaſion of ſuch omiſſions; *neceſſity* and *prudence* obliged me often to be very ſhort in my accounts of perſons. *Neceſſity,* when I wanted memoirs. *Prudence,* when I omitted groundleſs ſtories, or trifling occurrences. However, I had the ſacred writings for a precêdent.

Little

Little more is ſaid of a great many of the ancient *Patriarchs*, than *vixit, et mortuus eſt*; and yet *Moſes* was a good hiſtorian. Had no more been ſaid of ſome of your party, than that they lived in one year, and died in another, it would have been the beſt ingredient of their character.

Page 12.

Would have been large in ſpeaking of the diſcolous men of that body.

I was ſomewhat at a ſtand, to find, who they were, you call'd *diſcolous* men. But being provided with a key, to unlock your meaning, I perceived, they were certain *clergymen*, who oppoſing your attempts with too much violence, are repreſented as delinquents. It is an eaſy matter to account for, why they obtain a place in the hiſtory. They were not ſo bad, as to have no good qualities worth taking notice of; and if publick, and notorious miſbehaviour, which cannot be palliated, is acknowledged by an *hiſtorian*, he may have a juſt claim to impartiality; and what you quarrel with as a fault, will be to moſt others a ſubject of commendation. I ſpeak not this with diſreſpect to thoſe clergymen, you hint at. I meet with very few involved in matters againſt the ſtate; much fewer in domeſtick quarrels, deſtructive to the publick good of the catholick religion. Perhaps I might have done them more juſtice, in wiping off the aſperſions caſt upon them; which I was never found deficient in, in regard of ſeveral of your *ſuſpected brethren*; where I was obliged to ſweat,

and labour, before I could bring them off with a whole ſkin.

Page 13.

A judicious writer would have avoided ſuch ways of ſpeaking, as might give any ſuſpicion of an inclination, either to approve, or revive ſuch animoſities.

Cou'd I proceed more judiciouſly, or with greater tokens of impartiality, than to produce records, in order to give a truer idea of matters, than what was done long before by *More*, *Bartoli*, *Juvency*, and others of your writers, who had not only given a large account of thoſe animoſities, but diſcovered their inclinations to quarrels, and to renew them by actually approving of the pretenſions of one party with ſcurrilous reflexions upon the other? This, I hope, the *reader* will take notice of, when he find's you frequently charging me with being the firſt *reviver* of thoſe diſputes, and animoſities.

Page 14.

There is no leſs a whim in that ungrounded imagination of power in the Jeſuits.

I am very unwilling to touch upon matters that regard your *order* in general: yet *all power coming from God*, I hope there will be no harm in making you partakers of that divine *Attribute*, and miniſterially concurring in the works of *Providence*. I do not mention you, as guilty of any diſordinate affection for power;

power; but, that you have many good opportunities for obtaining it, and often do exerciſe it, is ſo far from being a *whim*, that no aſſertion can be better eſtabliſhed. Have you not the ear of moſt catholick *Princes?* Do they not make choice of you, for their *confeſſors?* Have you not a fair opportunity of recommending your friends, and favourites to places of dignity and profit, both in church and ſtate? Do not great numbers riſe upon that bottom? Did not Dr. *Allen* in particular own his preferment to the credit Father *Parſons* had with the *Pope?* And might not the clergy have juſt grounds to be apprehenſive of his power, when he ſo vigorouſly oppoſed their *agents* in ſo many inſtances? I have the greateſt reſpect imaginable for the prudent and pious inſtitutions of your order; eſpecially for that which has ſo glorious an appearance of humility, by incapacitating yourſelves for *prelatick* power without a diſpenſation. But yet, methinks, you manage that point in ſuch a manner, as to have more than an equivalent, and do not come up to the demands of a perfect ſelf-denial. Your caſe is parallel to that of one of our *Weſt-Saxon* Kings, who, having ſubdued ſeveral Princes of the *Heptarchy*, permitted them to enjoy their royalties; alledging, that it was more honourable to make Kings, than to be a King; as it is more honourable, and a greater token of power, to diſtribute *mitres*, than to wear them.

Page 15.

I remember to have told you ſeveral years ſince, upon your ſhewing me ſome pieces of your work.

I ſhou'd be glad, if any profeſſor of *agreeable converſation* wou'd inſtruct me, how to give the lye handſomely, without offence, as you have given me ſeveral occaſions in your *ſpecimen* to practiſe ſuch rules. I never ſhew'd you any pieces of the work in manuſcript, nor had I ever the honour of being in your company ſince any of the volumes were printed; ſo that the advice you pretend to have given me on thoſe occaſions, is entirely fictitious; not what you did, but what you thought yourſelf capable of doing. Mean time, 'tis very ſurpriſing, that you ſhou'd ſeem to affect a familiarity, and kind of intimacy with me, upon the nice footing of aſking and giving advice. Whether you deſign'd this as an honour to me, or to your ſelf, I will not ſay. If I had the character of being a fine writer, as you are pleaſed to obſerve, ſome eſteem me, I might have the vanity to think, you were ambitious of my acquaintance, upon a view of catching ſome applauſe; as is uſual with *witlings*, that thruſt themſelves into ſuch company, purpoſely, to make the world believe, they have a claim to ſome of their merit. Now, tho' you are well skilled in this way of hunting fame, as may be obſerved in ſome of your *trifling performances*; yet, in the preſent caſe, the mean opinion I have

of

of myſelf, and the bad opinion you have of me, is a bar againſt all ſuggeſtions of vanity on my ſide, or of improvement on your ſide by ſuch a converſation. Beſides, what inducement cou'd I have, either to ask, or to take your advice, whom I look'd upon as a perſon, upon many accounts, unqualified? 'Tis a dangerous thing, to have any dealings with two ſorts of perſons: *Bankrupts* in trade, and *Bankrupts* in learning. In one caſe you hazard your property; in the other you loſe your taſte, and judgment in books. The latter would have been my misfortune, had I given ear to your pretended inſtructions; as it will certainly be theirs, who are ſeduced by what you call amendments in your *Specimen*.

Page 16.

If writers of ſaints lives ſhould leave out moſt of the miracles.

If writers of other lives, than of *Saints*, wou'd conform themſelves to the *Canons*, in publiſhing miracles, there would be no occaſion of complaining ſo much of omiſſions. Even miracles aſcribed to ſaints require the approbation of the church, before they can paſs for authentick.

Page 18.

That learned man was right, who ſaid your work was no more a Hiſtory, than it is a Poem.

I meet with ſeveral things in your *Specimen*, that are ſurpriſing; but this is aſtoniſhing. I cannot believe, this learned man gave his opinion either out of prejudice, or out of weakneſs of

judgment. The ſtrongeſt prejudice cou'd not influence him to ſuch a degree of ſtupidity; nor cou'd the weakeſt judgment lye under ſuch an infatuation. All that I can ſay in his behalf, by way of excuſe, is, that he was either one of the inhabitants of *Bedlam*, or utter'd his thought in a *dream*. But if I muſt believe, he was *compos mentis*, or that you were not *delirious*, when you called him a *learned man*, and approved of his criticiſm, in ſtiling the work a *Poem*, rather than a *Dictionary*, or a parcel of *Records*: any common reader will think, I have an eaſy task upon my hands, when the *learned*, I engage with, declare their own incapacity.

Page 19.

Authors, and Readers are plural; and one and the other which ſhould correſpond to them, are in the ſingular number. No notice would have been taken of this, if you had not been a ſneerer at others under the name of grammarians.

Neither ſhou'd I have humbled myſelf ſo far as to take notice of it by a reply, had not your remark belonged to one of a lower claſs than a *grammarian*. According to the firſt rudiments of conſtruction, *the one*, and *the other*, are not applicable to *Authors*, or *Readers*, but to *each kind* diſtinctly.

Page 19.

You give your Reader to underſtand, that if it had not been for rubs of names, dates, and quotations, he might have expected fine periods.

Expected! from whom? not from me. I am free from theſe thoughts of vanity, you are ſo piouſly diſpoſed to charge me with. Diſclaiming fine periods, on *this occaſion*, does not imply, that I did arrogate unto myſelf that perfection, upon *any other*. I took the liberty only to obſerve in general, what it was, that uſually was an obſtruction to a ſmooth ſtile, and fine periods. My words are: *They are not to expect.* Your miſrepreſentation is: *He might have expected.*

Page 20.

You ought to have remember'd; that faith muſt often determine our judgment, where reaſon alone wou'd be an inſufficient guide.

I did not only remember, but attentively conſider, the functions of reaſon in all ſorts of enquiries: and therefore repreſented it no otherwiſe a guide, than when under *good management* and the direction of faith; words you have omitted, that you might have an opportunity of inſinuating a calumny, and indirectly accuſing me, as a favourer of *Freethinkers*. If you had no evil deſign, you at leaſt diſcover either your ignorance, or want of reflexion, in not explaining yourſelf, as all divines do upon that ſubject; who all agree, that Chriſtian religion is a *rational* religion: That there is nothing in faith contrary to *reaſon:* and that every particular article of faith is ſupported by *rational proofs* of its credibility. Both faith, and reaſon are ſufficient guides, when they go hand in hand; and cannot exclude each other.

Page

Page 20.

To improve ignorance, in propriety of words, is to make it greater.

I always thought, that *improving* things was making them better; but, according to your skill in the propriety of words, 'tis making things *worſe*; and improving ignorance, is not removing, deſtroying, and aboliſhing it, but making it *greater*. I was in hopes, a good-natur'd *Reader* would have lent a helping hand to a poor man in diſtreſs, who was ſo unfortunate as to make uſe of the *abſtract*, inſtead of the *concrete*; and, to the ſcandal of ſome nice chriſtians, talk of improving *ignorance*, inſtead of improving the *ignorant*. But if I muſt fall a ſacrifice to a *trifling pedant*, let the child play with his rattle, and ride in triumph upon his hobby-horſe.

Page 21.

They may by improper education fail of being carried on in a right progreſs of knowledge; but the notions themſelves grafted by nature cannot be put into confuſion.

This appear's to me to be a ſtaring contradiction. Can there be a greater confuſion in our notions, than to be render'd incapable of finding out the truth? Is not the confuſion, the heathenish nations lay under for ſo many ages, both with reſpect to a *Deity*, and *morality*, a plain diſproof of your aſſertion? Is not education a kind of ſecond nature, whereby poiſonous weeds grow up, and ſmother the good ſeed that was firſt ſown? You are yourſelf, *Clerophilus*, an undenia-

undeniable inſtance of this kind. Nature at firſt beſtowed upon you a rectitude of mind: but education, and ſome other bad influences, have made you ſo remarkable a cripple as to your intellects, and judgment, that you neither think nor talk rationally, where domeſtick intereſt is concern'd.

Page 21.

Few lines of your preface are free from them.

I look upon this, and ſuch other magiſterial and general cenſures, ſo frequent in your ſpecimen, to be words of courſe, in order to keep the reader tight to your intereſt; leſt he ſhould now and then be tempted to forſake you; as he wou'd be in every page, did not you ſpur him on in the cauſe. If faults are to be found almoſt in every page, you have been ſo kind, as only to mention a few; which, tho' trivial, we may ſuppoſe to be the moſt material. As for the reſt, you are ſo prudent a manager as to bundle them up together, and make *ipſe dixit* your only voucher.

Page 22.

And the conſequence muſt be, that becauſe religion is an enemy to partiality, therefore thoſe that are influenced by religion in judging of Hiſtory are under invincible prejudices.

Pardon me, dear *Clerophilus*, I cannot adopt the illegitimate offspring of your adulterous brain. Can any thing be more unconteſted, than that *Religion* is an enemy to *Partiality*; meaning by *Partiality* an unfair, and unjuſt way of defend-

defending a cauſe? for then *Religion* is as much an enemy to partiality, as to lying, perjury, equivocating, or to any other offence againſt good morals. Now for a clear diſcovery of your ignorance, or treacherous way of proceeding, I leave the *Reader* to judge from our own words. My words are: *They that make religion the only teſt of hiſtorical facts, may be ſaid to labour under invincible prejudices.* The inference you make and fix upon me is this: *Becauſe religion is an enemy to partiality, therefore thoſe that are influenced by religion in judging of hiſtory, are under invincible prejudices.* Any one of common underſtanding may eaſily ſee, that my words cou'd give no occaſion for ſuch an inference. They only import, that a perſon being of this or that religion, is not a ſufficient proof of his ſpeaking either true or falſe: becauſe members of the true religion are as capable of lying, as thoſe of a falſe religion are of telling truth. Is there not a palpable difference between being of a religion, and *being influenced* by it, either as to words, or facts? Are *Romancers* of the true religion influenced by their religion, when they tell lies? or perſons of a falſe religion, when they ſpeak truth? I take you, *Clerophilus*, to be a profeſſor of the true religion; but no one will judge, you were *influenced* by your religion, when you aſperſed me with ſo many *irreligious* imputations. I know no religion among Chriſtians that allow's of lying, tho' ſome profeſſors, that bear that name, to the ſcandal of that name, allow of *equivocations*.

Page

Page 24.

I was one of thoſe who told you in a friendly manner of many material paſſages and perſons left out, which had a right to be remember'd.

This is one of the fictitious converſations you had with me. I never have ſeen you, ſince any parts of the Hiſtory were publiſhed. Such accounts deſerve a harſher name than miſrepreſentations.

Page 25.

Perſons of moderate curioſity and reading can, without flattering themſelves, aſſure you, there are very few things of moment in your work, which they did not know before.

Thoſe, that have taken the pains to ſearch after ſo many particulars, I have mentioned in the Hiſtory, cannot be called men of *moderate reading*. But I am often obliged, to indulge you the privilege of ſuch expreſſions, as you think will tend towards the diſcrediting of the work; tho' they are void of probability. And it may be affirmed, with a great deal of juſtice, that thoſe perſons of *moderate reading* were no leſs moderate in their capacity, and little to be regarded in what they ſaid, or rather in what you ſay for them. 'Tis well you own, that ſome things of moment eſcaped their induſtry: wherein thoſe diligent writers, *More*, *Bartoli*, and *Juvency*, muſt alſo acknowledge their want of intelligence. But whereas you add, they are only a few, your own eyes will diſprove you. The collection of records, which

which never appear'd before, if printed at full, wou'd make a formidable volume, and throw you into a greater conſternation, than as they lie ſcattered in the parts of the hiſtory.

Page 26.

One cannot but wonder, that you ſhould mention (Du Pin) in other places with commendation, and without cautioning your reader againſt ſo bad a writer.

If your head had any ſhare of what drop's from your pen, you cou'd not be ignorant, why I make mention of *Du Pin*; and that your reflexions on this occaſion are incapable of a good conſtruction. Muſt a *writer* always have an *Antidote* at hand, and lay down before the reader a liſt of the errors, and *erratas* of every author he quote's? *Mariana* may be quoted as a good hiſtorian, without making a publick declaration againſt his king-killing doctrine; and many other of your eminent writers refer'd to, without offending the *Reader*'s noſe with the ſtink of their *caſuiſtry*. The commendation I give to *Du Pin*, is no more, than that he had a good faculty in making abridgments. I had no occaſion to take notice of him in any other reſpect. His errors in doctrinal matters, or any other miſbehaviour, cou'd not detract from his natural abilities in being a ſuccinct deſcriber of facts; nor be any more the ground of a reproach againſt me, than if I had commended him for writing a fair hand, or cutting his letters with exactneſs.

Page

Page 28.

In both, there is the ſame turn of language, the ſame air of ſtile; even the ſame affected uſe of particular words, ſuch as hugely, *&c. The ſame pompouſneſs of Title; even to the formality of dividing both works into eight parts.* —— *till you diſown thoſe letters, I muſt call them your's.*

Nothing can be a more convincing proof of your want of judgment, than the weakneſs you diſcover concerning thoſe letters, intituled the *Secret Policy*. 'Tis far from good reaſoning, to imagine, that your cavils againſt thoſe letters, will paſs for a confutation of the *Church Hiſtory*; or that your conjectures will amount to proofs, that they came from the ſame hand. I have already ſatisfied all judicious readers, as to the firſt; and leave them to form a judgment of the latter from the following conſiderations. In the firſt place, you ſeem not acquainted with the true *Characteriſticks* for diſtinguiſhing and fixing writings upon proper perſons; ſeeing you rely upon ſuch, as have always been exploded by the beſt judges in thoſe matters. What a confuſion wou'd there be, both in the writings of the ancient fathers, and even in thoſe of the *ſacred canon*, if every one was permitted to reject, or admit, what books he pleaſed, from a reſemblance, or non-reſemblance of ſtile? Again, is it not a hard caſe to be debarr'd from the uſe of *Dictionaries* in the choice of words, or from making uſe of the phraſes one meet's with

with in an author, if they are for his purpoſe? As for that *keen obſervation*, that the *Secret Policy*, and the *Church Hiſtory* are divided into the ſame number of parts, I cannot ſay, what motive the aforeſaid *writer* might have, to make his work conſiſt of *eight parts*. But as for myſelf, I was of opinion that a Hiſtory, containing the tranſactions of *eight reigns*, naturally fell into ſuch a diviſion; and this I aſſure you, without any alluſion to the *Secret Policy*, or to *William Lilly's* eight parts of ſpeech, or to the deſign of any other perſon, that was diſpoſed to divide his work into the ſame number of parts. But why have I not diſown'd myſelf to to be the author of the *Secret Policy*, which is charged upon me? Charged upon me! by whom? Is it uſual, to anſwer queſtions, before a perſon is ask'd? or a token of guilt, not to make a diſclaim before an impeachment? And when was I called upon, or before what proper authority, to make a diſclaim? Let who will be the author of that book, he did not think it proper, to ſatisfy every impertinent *Queſtioner*; nor will you be eſteem'd either a man of good judgment, or of good reputation, unleſs you fix it upon better grounds.

Page 29.

Your ſcandalous Pamphlet, intitled: the hiſtory of Doway *College.*

If this is a ſcandalous *pamphlet*, as you repreſent it to be, the imputation is ſcandalous to fix it upon me, unleſs you have better grounds,

than

than conjectures from common report. The imputation will bear an action in the caſe of *defamation:* but common report is no proof in order to a *conviction.*

Page 30.

What would an enemy do worſe, than to call the ſcandalous, and refractory men of that body by the name of the body in general?

What can a *libeller* do worſe, than to aſperſe the moſt illuſtrious men of the clergy for being ſcandalous, and refractory perſons? I have already plainly demonſtrated, by the liſt of the perſons, and their approved characters, that they were far from being ſcandalous perſons; and that they may as juſtly claim the name and ſtile of the body of the clergy, as (with proportion) the prelates in a general council are called the church. But, according to your ſtile, all are called ſcandalous, who oppoſed your ſchemes; and refractory, if they remonſtrated againſt abuſes. Hence proceed's your falſe repreſentation, that I am always *on the ſide of the factious.* But 'tis not to be wonder'd at in thoſe, who always meaſure merit by the affection perſons have for your order; and never fail to clap a *but* into every man's character, that doe's not give proofs of his zeal in that way. Omiſſions of that kind are always criminal.

Page 30.

A pamphlet intitled a catholick ſyſtem of allegiance.

This pamphlet, according to your conjectural method, you aſcribe to me. There is no occaſion, to take notice of your weakneſs and want of judgment in ſuch kinds of imputations. I have ſufficiently expoſed it already. But it will not be improper, to acquaint you with what I have heard from a perſon of conſiderable learning and curioſity, concerning that *pamphlet: viz.* that the *author* had borrowed his arguments in the rational way from that great divine of your order *Suarez*; and, to convince me, put into my hands a treatiſe of his, all tending to the ſame purpoſe. 'Tis in your choice: You muſt either acquit the *author* of the ſyſtem, or condemn *Suarez* as an *illogical* and *untheological* writer.

Page 31.

Much leſs did I then know, that the monita ſecreta were from your hand.

I have already convinced you to be an *impoſtor*, in fixing that piece of policy upon me; and, at the ſame time, was ſo juſt to myſelf, as to call upon you for reparation; which you cannot refuſe, if you have any ſenſe of that part of a chriſtian's duty. Meantime, 'tis not my buſineſs, to enquire after the true author of that *pamphlet*, tho' it may be your's. A diligent enquirer after ſuch matters, tell's me, the writer was a *diſcarded Jeſuit*. What the contents are, I cannot tell; having never read it. But your *diſcarded brother* may probably know

know more of your ſecrets, than I can pretend to.

Page 31.

It was proper to mention them here; becauſe it will make all judicious readers be more cautious in crediting your preſent hiſtory, while they have reaſon to think, you could write, or publiſh ſuch horrid pieces.

The reader has heard the *play*; and at laſt come's out the *plot*. It ſeem's all this noiſe, and cavilling about thoſe *pamphlets*, was not to comply with your taſk of amendments to the hiſtory, but to promote the imaginary ſervice it would do you, if you could fix them upon me, either by reports, conjectures, ſuppoſitions, or even by fictions, in order to diſcredit me; and, by your way of arguing, bring an *odium* upon the hiſtory. Such a ſtratagem may have ſome effect with the undiſcerning populace: but no man of ſound judgment will think you talk either like a chriſtian, or like a rational creature.

Page 34.

By frequent falſe informations, by injurious characters, by plotting, tricking, deceitful ways; if theſe things, I ſay, are as you repreſent them, it is impoſſible, the Jeſuits, you thus repreſent, ſhould be men of virtue and worth.

You know beſt, from whence you took thoſe reflecting characters; I am ſure, not from any expreſſions of mine in the *Church Hiſtory*. I was always diſpoſed, and behaved accordingly,

to maintain the good moral characters of your brethren, eſpecially of thoſe that had a reputation for ſanctity, notwithſtanding their attempts againſt the clergy. I put them upon the ſame footing with the greateſt Saints; who were obliged to have recourſe to ignorance, ſurpriſe, miſinformation, miſtaken zeal, *&c.* in order to ſupport their moral character, when they had been diſcover'd to oppoſe truth and juſtice, both in facts and opinions, contrary to faith. But if any of your party have been found tricking, deceitful, giving injurious characters, or wrong informations; as I am unwilling to accuſe them, ſo I am under no obligation of defending them.

Page 34.

If the injuries, you complain of, were ſlight, and done ſo harmleſsly, as not to hinder the Jeſuits from being men of great virtue; why do you complain ſo heavily?

You often call upon me, almoſt in every page, to obſerve this thing and t'other: and yet I am ſo dull, as not to attend. Here indeed, I have attended, and taken notice of a remark, which I believe few people would have made, beſides your ſelf; who are particularly diſtinguiſhed for the inſignificancy of your obſervations. May not things that appear *little*, and what you call *ſlight*, be in their conſequences a ſubject of the greateſt complaint? May not *ſchemes*, laid without any detriment to the virtuous character of the *Projector*,

Projector, be carried on in ſuch a manner, that he may ſtand in need of an apology? If the *Projector* is harmleſs in laying the *ſcheme*, thoſe, that are great ſufferers by it, have juſt reaſon to complain. The text is too plain to ſtand in need of a comment.

Page 35.

They alſo, you ſay, have a right to be thought men of virtue.

Queſtionleſs they have; and much more, if due regard be had to their dignity, merits, and publick character; in all which reſpects, they are ſuperior to thoſe they contended with: and if there be any occaſion for excuſes on either ſide, they have both an equal claim to it. But then, there is this difference between your way of proceeding and mine; I endeavour to excuſe your party, by allowing them the liberty to have recourſe to all the circumſtances, that are capable of ſupporting their moral character; you on the contrary, throw about your cenſures promiſcuouſly againſt all, that oppoſe your proceeding; it being not your cuſtom, or to your purpoſe, to excuſe, or make any diſtinction between perſons and perſons, but to ſuppoſe them equally concern'd both as to the ſubſtance and to the manner of defending a cauſe.

Page 35.

Watſon *begg'd pardon at his execution for the injuries he had done to the ſociety.*

Watſon was very much in the wrong, in the injuries he had done to the *Jeſuits*; but much in the right in maintaining the rights of the clergy. Like a good chriſtian, when he came to dye, he begg'd pardon for the one, but had no occaſion to repent of the other. Paſſion in the defence of a cauſe, and the juſtice of a cauſe are different conſiderations.

Page 35.

Several of them, by their future diſaſters, into which their diſorders caſt them, leave no room for excuſe.

To pry into the ſecrets of divine providence is high preſumption, and uſurpation over the decrees of the Almighty. The misfortunes, that happen in life, are not to be aſcribed to the cauſes, we are ſo raſh to aſſign. Such applications are the effects of paſſion and prejudice, and tend to ſtigmatize an adverſary by repreſenting him to be as much out of God's favour, as our's. I am afraid you have followed this method in mentioning the misfortunes, that befell ſome of your back-friends; which might have another origin than the injuries done to your order. A great many, that oppoſed your ſchemes, were very fortunate, raiſed by their merits to the higheſt dignities in this life, and we hope rewarded in the next. Was their good fortune owing to the oppoſition they made againſt you? Several *Jeſuits*, and friends to your order, and ſome of them remarkable *ſticklers* againſt the clergy, have

been unfortunate: Are you willing, I ſhall aſcribe their misfortunes to their being adverſaries to the *Clergy*? If ſome were ſo good chriſtians, as to aſk pardon for injuries done you; it may be wonder'd, ſome of your's did not follow their example, when they had aſpers'd ſeveral eminent clergymen.

Page 37.

To whom you might have added all the world beſides.

Who could more properly be mentioned on this occaſion than *Hiſtorians* and *Moraliſts*, whoſe buſineſs it is, in a particular manner, to make ſuch reflexions? I might, indeed, have referr'd the reader to *Libellers*, *Ballad-makers*, *Specimen-writers*, and all the world beſides: but I believe all judicious perſons would have look'd upon it as an impertinence, as it is trifling in you to require it.

Page 37.

The more probable it is, that they were ſuch an introduction, the leſs ſurprizing that revolution would be.

Could not the controverſies, that happened in the foregoing ages, be a kind of introduction to the pretended *Reformation*; and at the ſame time be a ſurpriſe to many, when the *Revolution* happen'd? Only God by his foreſight can diſcover, what the event of things will be in the proceſs of time. A pilfering youth never reflect's, that the gallows will be his end

at the laſt. His misbehaviour was certainly an introduction to his hard fate; and a great ſurpriſe upon him, as he never conſidered how he diſpoſed himſelf for it. Thus providence drew our nation on, by ſlow and almoſt imperceptible ſteps, to the general defection under *Henry* VIII. which none could foreſee, when thoſe controverſies happened; but were a ſurprize to their ſucceſſors, when they had ſo deplorable an effect in the end; as all judicious writers, ſince, have obſerv'd, they gradually tended towards a rupture.

Page 37.

You might, upon the reaſon you mention, have carried us up to Adam.

To turn over the hiſtories of all nations, and run up to *Adam*, in order to ſhew, that there ſeldom happened any conſiderable alteration, either in publick, or private affairs, without ſome previous diſpoſitions, would have been a ſuperfluous labour in one, that confined himſelf to the hiſtory of one nation: and none, but a *trifling caviller* could amuſe his readers with ſuch an expectation. But as a keen ſportſman beat's likely, and unlikely, to meet with game; ſo a hunter after *amendments* throw's away a great deal of time at the expence of his judgment.

Page 38.

Some are pleaſed to conjecture, that St. Peter *came into* Great Britain. *It ſtand's upon too*

good authority, to be called a conjecture at pleaſure.

You, who lay ſo great a ſtreſs upon conjectures, ſuppoſitions, and traditionary reports, in caſes of the greateſt conſequence, and build your arguments upon them as proofs; why are you ſo ſcrupulous, as not to be content with them in relation to St. *Peter's* viſiting *Great Britain* in perſon? Mean time you will infinitely oblige a great many learned men, by producing that good authority, you hint at, in confirmation of their conjectures.

Page 38.

Is there no inconſiſtency to maintain, that one of them was the firſt, tho' another, that came after, was the firſt?

Is there no fraudulent dealing, in miſapplying the word *firſt*, with a deſign of framing an inconſiſtency? St. *Joſeph* of *Arimathea* is mentioned as the firſt, that built a Chriſtian church: and then the word *firſt* is not applicable to any other of the apoſtolick miſſioners. What is ſaid of them is, that *whether all or only ſome of them perform'd their miſſion among us; both which may be maintain'd without any inconſiſtency.* Had I ſaid, they all preach'd the firſt, and that at different times; there had indeed been a contradiction. But as my words lye, 'tis a fiction of your own.

Page 38.

Why did you omit to give an account of the ſaints Urſula, and Wineſred —— I believe you are

are the firſt, and will be the laſt, that will be guilty of ſuch an omiſſion.

Omiſſions are your *common place Book* for amendments: how injudiciouſly made uſe of, the reader may be convinced by what I have ſaid upon that ſubject in my general reply. As to omitting theſe two ſaints; my deſign was only to touch the *Britiſh Hiſtory* in a general way; which made me take the liberty, to omit not only them, but above a hundred others, celebrated for their ſanctity. None of our ancient hiſtories, either *Britiſh* or *Saxons*, do ſo much as name them: not that I call in queſtion the account later hiſtorians give of them; but as I am not the firſt, guilty of that omiſſion; ſo I believe I ſhall not be the laſt, unleſs there be more occaſion to take notice of them, than I had.

Page 39.

Why do you ſeem ſo willing to deny, that St. Auguſtin *and his companions, ſent by St.* Gregory *the great, were* Benedictin *Monks? what could make you inſinuate, that they were of the ſecular clergy?*

To ſeem *willing* to deny, and to *inſinuate*, are your comment upon my words, who never deſign'd to ſpeak deciſively in that controverſy. But as I find you are a ſtranger to ſuch matters, I muſt deſire you will conſult the following authors, who are good judges in antiquities: *viz. Baronius, Natalis Alexander, Richard Smith* biſhop of *Chalcedon*, Mr. *Broughton*, biſhop *Tanner*, Mr. *Willis*, Mr. *Battley*, *Heskenius*, and *Papebro*

Pebrochious, with many others, who either expreſsly affirm, or are inclined to believe, that Saint *Auguſtin* and his aſſociate miſſioners were not *Benedictin* Monks. And as for ſome of them, if not moſt of 'em being *Clergymen*, I referr you to *Ven. Bede's* account compared with the *Letters* extant, between St. *Gregory*, St. *Auguſtin*, and others: whereby it appear's, that Saint *Auguſtin* had only three perſons with him, that came from *Rome: vid. Laurence*, *Peter* and *John*; that, ſtopping in *France*, ſeveral *French* prieſts joined with them as *Co-operators:* ſo that, when they landed in the iſle of *Thanet*, they were almoſt forty in number. Whether this be a ſufficient ground to conjecture, that many of them were *Clergymen*, I leave to the reader to determin.

Page 39.

You was pleaſed to call the Heptarchy by the name of the oeconomy of our anceſtors. This is juſt as fine, as if you ſhould tell us, the diviſions into Ridings is the preſent oeconomy of Yorkſhire.

You cou'd have no other deſign in this ingenious compariſon between the *Heptarchy* and *Ridings* of *Yorkſhire*, but the pleaſure you found in kicking about the word *Oeconomy*, againſt which you have conceived a diſtaſte, as appear's upon ſeveral occaſions. Otherwiſe I don't find, upon a ſtrict examination, that my words can give you any offence, or be a proper ſubject of an attempt for ridicule. Do not all writers ſpeak of the *Saxon* government under that diviſion? and was it not ſeaſonable to take notice of it, when

when an account was to follow of the converſion of every particular kingdom of the *Heptarchy*? Playing at puſh-pin is a better entertainment, than many of your idle remarks.

Page 41.

There appears very little probability of their being ſuch an introduction, unleſs you will bring it from this wiſe remark; that he could not ſo impiouſly have deſtroyed them, if the piety of our anceſtors had never raiſed them up.

I leave ſuch wiſe remarks to thoſe, that are capable of making no better; which they muſt never attempt, who know not, how to diſtinguiſh between the uſe, and, the abuſe of things. Can any man, that intends to talk rationally, imagine, that things, that are good in themſelves, can be judged an introduction to evil, any other ways, than by being abuſed? It was not the inſtitution of the *Goſpel*, that introduced ſuch a number of *Hereſies* in every age; but the undiſciplin'd and immoral lives of many of the profeſſors. It was not the pious erecting of Monaſteries, that occaſioned their diſſolution; but a conſtellation of cauſes from perſons miſbehaviour in every ſtation of life, both *Clergy*, *Religious*, and the *Laity*, who prepar'd the way for that general defection under king *Henry* VIII.

Page 41.

The affair of the divorce has been diſcuſs'd by ſo many writers, that it is commonly ſo well known, that

that there was not the leaſt occaſion of being ſo profuſe upon it.

There is ſcarce any man, beſides a profeſſed *Caviller*, that would take occaſion to quarrel with me upon this ſubject. And, tho' I know you are determin'd to repreſent all my accounts either as too long, or too ſhort; yet I thought, you had more good nature and judgment, than to mention the divorce as an inſtance of the firſt kind. I own, ſeveral learned writers have diſcuſs'd that point: but few, or none, have thrown matters together, or deſcended to ſo many particulars. Theſe writers lay before me. One thing, indeed, I was unhappy in, that I cou'd not meet with any performance of that kind in Engliſh from ſome learned hand of your party. But why do you decry my labours in ſo good a cauſe? or why are not the ignorant to be inform'd, tho' ſome are already acquainted with the account I give?

Page 42.

You muſt give me leave to wonder, how you could think, that the ambiguity of the title of the king's headſhip left room for a ſpiritual ſupremacy elſewhere.

You muſt alſo give me leave to wonder (i miſrepreſentations can be an object of wonder, where they are ſo frequent) how you can call that my opinion, when you yourſelf own, that I take notice of it only as being the opinion of others. You endeavour to bring your ſelf off, by ſaying, at leaſt I ought to ſignify, that it was not

not my opinion. I never doubted of the *Pope's* being head of the Church, or that the *King* cou'd not claim that title. How can I dive into the ſecret of your vile ſuſpicions? or am I obliged to make a profeſſion of faith, as often as ſome ſeem to want common underſtanding?

Page 42.

It is farther very wonderful, that you ſhould ſay, that you will not pretend to determine, whether thoſe divine's have miſtaken the caſe of the King's ſupremacy.

Where *Proteſtant* divines are at a loſs, where to place the *King's* ſupremacy, and contradict one another, is it my buſineſs to reconcile them? and tho' it be plain to you, and me, that he claim'd as full a power in ſpiritual matters, as the *Pope* did, yet ſeveral Proteſtant writers do not extend his ſupremacy ſo far.

Page 42.

You muſt be particularly minded, to correct your approbation of Mr. Collier *in what he ſays, that the Pope's annexing tythes to monaſteries was an incroachment and down right Popery.*

There is no occaſion of being put in mind of correcting a fault, which you yourſelf own I am not guilty of. For tho' you raſhly affirm, that I approve of Mr. *Collier's* words, you withdraw the charge by aſking, whether I do approve of 'em or no? This is what you found your ſelf oblig'd to: it being plain from the paſſage itſelf, that I only barely relate

relate Mr. *Collier*'s words without any approbation. This is not only one of your encroachments upon truth; but a down right impoſition.

Page 43.

That the catholick Clergy have reaſon to think themſelves hardly dealt with.

If the clergy ſuffer'd no hardſhips by having the *Parochial Tythes* annexed to the monaſteries, no inconvenience whatever, that happen's in this life, can be a ſubject of complaint. For tho' the laws are juſt, and the ſubject is oblig'd to ſubmit; yet he cannot but complain of the ſmart, he feel's. The word *hardſhip* is capable of a better meaning, than *injuſtice*. The ecree of the Almighty was juſt, in condemning all mankind to ſickneſs, death, wars, plagues, famines, and other innumerable hardſhips, which followed from that Decree. The order for annexing *Tythes* to monaſteries, was juſt; but the hardſhip, the clergy underwent by that alienation, cannot be conceal'd. Originally the *Tythes* belonged to the parochial clergy. Now, when monaſteries were founded under the *Saxons*, lands were ſettled upon them out of the *Founder's* ſubſtance; and it ſeldom happened, that any *Tythes* were appropriated to them, unleſs they lay within the precincts of the *convent*. But, by degrees, eſpecially when the *Monks* had ſo great power, and the *Normans* came to govern, they had a cheaper way of founding *religious* houſes: which was, by ſtripping the parochial clergy of their tythes, and appro-

appropriating them for the ſubſiſtence of *Monks*. I diſpute neither the lawfulneſs of the power, nor the prudential part in ſuch foundations; nor ſay, that the clergy were dealt with unjuſtly, by being deprived of thoſe benefices, they, perhaps, at that time were not thought worthy of. But that they underwent great hardſhip, cannot be denied; if we will give words their true meaning. Was it no hardſhip, to be deprived of a competency for improving themſelves in learning, or maintaining their reputation by an academical education? Was it no hardſhip, to have the clergy obliged to become *Vicars*, *Curates*, and *Chaplains*, and ſubſiſt by ſmall penſions, while the groſs of the parochial tythes was conſum'd in *Monaſteries*? Was it no hardſhip, to have the flock neglected, and left to the conduct of poor clergymen, without money, without learning, and, as the conſequence uſually is, without authority? Was it no hardſhip, for clergymen to wait, and attend at the gates of monaſteries, and the levies of great *Abbots*, and *Priors*? In fine, to be reduced to ſuch a ſtate of indigence, that many thouſands of them wanted both food and rayment, and became objects of contempt and ridicule? Theſe circumſtances may truly be call'd *Hardſhips*, without any reflexion upon the powers, from whence the regulation of tythes was deriv'd, who cou'd not foreſee the inconveniences and abuſes, that afterwards happen'd; nor prevent them, 'till it was too late, and at laſt ended in that deplorable defection under

Henry

Henry VIII, when the exorbitant power, and riches of the monaſteries, and the precarious dependence of the generality of the clergy provok'd and encouraged the enemies of the church to ſtrike a blow, which cou'd not be warded off.

Page 44.

Abſolving ſuppoſe's a former tye.

When the abſolution is only declarative, it does not.

Page 45.

Your theological notions muſt be very odd, if you think, theſe two propoſitions are not of ſo evil an aſpect, as the two others.

And you muſt have a great deal of front, to be guilty of a moſt notorious interpolation of my words, as it were purpoſely to deceive your Readers. Have not propoſitions, that attack only *ſome particular tenets* of faith, a better aſpect, than thoſe, that deſtroy the fundamentals of chriſtian religion? You overlook this conſideration, and cook up matters ſuitably to your own vicious taſte, and nouriſh the habitual diſtemper of miſrepreſentation. To this purpoſe you make me ſay, that among propoſitions of an evil aſpect, were theſe; that *ceremonies were ſuperſtitious, and holydays were to be aboliſhed:* And among propoſitions, that were not of ſo evil an aſpect, were; that *there was no real preſence in the bleſſed ſacrament*, and that *praying to ſaints was an erroneous practice.* But why did you inſidiouſly omit thoſe Propoſitions, that tended to the total ſubverſion of chriſtianity?

vid. *the aboliſhing of baptiſm, prieſthood, and obligation of obeying human laws.* Theſe errors had a more evil aſpect, in the opinion of the whole aſſembly, who condemned the 59 Propoſitions. But as for thoſe propoſitions you mention, and ſeveral others, thoſe divines being an aſſembly of mixt perſons, ſome whereof were known to favour the reformation, what wonder is it, if *in their eyes* the errors about the real preſence, and praying to ſaints had not ſo evil an aſpect?

Page 46.

Whether you ought to have caſt ſuch an aſperſion upon the Cardinals.

Your charity towards the *Cardinals* is very extenſive, and remarkable; and I wiſh, for your own ſake, you had been as favourable to others, eſpecially to myſelf; which you ought to have been, according to the rule, you here expreſs: *viz.* that a charge *upon a ſingle perſon, where it is not ſupported with unqueſtionable proofs, would be highly criminal.* But what is the Aſperſion caſt upon the Cardinals? and by whom? The aſperſion is, that if *Wolſey* had appear'd perſonally at *Rome*, he cou'd not have fail'd of gaining his point, being provided with proper *baits*, to lay before the Cardinals. *Wolſey* was a perſon of great wit, and penetration, and of no ſmall intereſt with ſeveral princes: So that his arguments, and other conſiderations might have prevail'd to gain a majority among the *Cardinals.* Neither do I think, you are ſo great a ſtranger to the hiſto-

rie

ries of the *Conclave*, as to imagine, that every *Cardinal* is incapabable of being drawn from a party. I have a great reſpect for the body in general, and for every member according to his behaviour: yet I believe 'tis your opinion, that *Wolſey*, as being *Cardinal*, wou'd have taken a *bait*. And if he, why might not others; without any reflexion upon that *auguſt* aſſembly? After all, if the word *a bait* be judged diſreſpectful to the *Cardinals*, I do not find my ſelf affected by it. I only report the ſentiments of others; as my words plainly ſhew, when I ſay: *many were of opinion*, that had he appear'd perſonally in the conclave, *&c.*

Page 47.

And ſure you would not excuſe one, (Fox *Biſhop of* Hereford) *who died a great ſtickler againſt the ſee of* Rome, *in the controverſies of the divorce, and ſupremacy.*

I no farther excuſe him, than by the charitable opinion I have of a great many others, who were carried away with the ſtream of the times. Several of them liv'd to recant; as *Gardiner*, *Bonner*, and others, with the main body of the clergy. As for biſhop *Fox* in particular, tho' I meet with no poſitive proofs of his recanting; yet dying at a favourable time, before the nation was quite cut off by the *Pope's Bull*, he had time for recollection, and afforded me an opportunity to ſpeak charitably of him. But that he *died a ſtickler* againſt the church of *Rome*, is an addition of yours to my words:

that he was once a ſtickler againſt the holy ſee is allowed; but that he died ſo, is your fiction.

Page 47.

Why do you ſay, it may be queſtioned, whether he [*Dr.* Colet] *deſired ſuch a reformation, as ſoon after happened? you ſeem inclined to believe he did not.*

We may very well queſtion the truth of things, that are abſolutely falſe. Such expreſſions are not uncommon, when perſons have a mind to deliver their ſentiments with modeſty; which you, a profeſſor of *agreeable converſation*, cannot be ignorant of. But your ſaying, I am only *ſeemingly* inclined to believe, he was no friend to the reformation, that ſoon after happened, has no good aſpect; conſidering the character I give of him, that he poſitively was no friend to it.

Page 48.

I will only ask, why you would place the vile ſupplication of Fiſh,—— why at leaſt did you not join Sir Thomas More's *reply to that ſupplication.*

I will give a direct anſwer to both your Queſtions. The firſt was ask'd me by a particular friend, not by way of reproach, but moved by a better ſpirit, than, I am afraid, you are. The anſwer I gave was; that it was ſo exact a deſcription of the humour of thoſe times, and ſo expoſed the vile notions of thoſe that aim'd at a *reformation*, that I thought it would not be

be unſeaſonable, nor much amiſs to give it at full. As to your ſecond queſtion, a proteſtant gentleman, who read it over in my hearing, ſaid, there was no occaſion of a reply, by way of *Antidote*, from any catholick; it being a *Lampoon* againſt virtue and religion in general, and anſwer'd itſelf.

Page 49.

How could you ſay, a great many of the clergy wanted not zeal to ſupport the old religion.

The biſhops of *Henry* VIII's reign gave proofs of their zeal for all the tenets of the old religion, excepting the Pope's ſupremacy. Were not the *Lutherans* generally proſecuted? and as for *Edward* VI's reign, did they not immediately pull off the maſk, ſuffer themſelves to be deprived, and impriſon'd for maintaining the Pope's ſupremacy? Some, indeed conform'd to the ſtate.

Page 49.

I am willing to think, you do not include praying to ſaints.

You ought to be poſitive, I did not include it. I never gave you occaſion to judge, that I look'd upon praying to ſaints as a ſuperfluity, or mere ceremony. But you have ſo great an itch to miſrepreſent matters, that you can ſcarce reſiſt any temptation that come's in your way.

Page 49.

Whatever opinion therefore, any catholick may be willing to have of your faith.

Whatever opinion any chriſtian may have of your charity, you give no good tokens of it, by giving hints of ſuſpecting my faith.

Page 50.

How came Luther, Melancthon, Oecolampadius, Bucer, *and* Calvin, *for example, to have their lives inſerted?*

Upon my word, Sir, it was with no ill deſign. What is more common than to make digreſſions, tho' often little to the purpoſe? This you know by experience from your ſpecimen, and ſome other of your perſormances; where you have been ſo kind and merciful to the reader, as to relieve him, and keep him awake by ſome impertinent digreſſion. Nothing of this kind induced me, to inſert the lives, which ſo much diſpleaſe you. It was indeed, a digreſſion; but very much to the purpoſe. Thoſe hereticks were the firſt projectors of the pretended reformation: They correſponded with, and were conſtantly conſulted by the reformers in *England:* Some of them were invited, and came over to aſſiſt, and inſtruct our countrymen, who were as yet but novices in the method of reforming. Now as a great many readers might be curious to know ſomething concerning thoſe perſons, between whom and our pretended reformers there was ſo great an affinity; this induced me to give a ſhort account of their lives.

Page 50.

It made me ſmile, to find you remarking, that Melancthon

Melancthon *took that name from Greek words, which are of the ſame import with his true one in the High Dutch tongue.*

What conceit was in *Melancthon*'s head and the reſt, to take *Greek* names, I cannot tell; neither is it material, why, or by what means, I came to make that obſervation. If it made you ſmile, it ſeems, the fancy pleaſed you ſo well, that you were reſolved to imitate them, and aſſume the name of *Clerophilus*; which made me not only *ſmile*, but laugh heartily; and tempted me, to make my readers merry at your expence, by bantering, ſneering, flirting hints, and *innuendoes*, and ſuch ſort of ways you complain I am accuſtom'd to; which perhaps wou'd have put an end to your *ſmiling*, and made you look *grave*, if not *angry:* But finding you to be a very bungling *Copier* of the originals, that lay before you, and that the *Greek* word, you made choice of, had nothing like the import of your true name, character, or behaviour; I contented myſelf only to *laugh* on, and pity your folly.

Page 51.

You have omitted to obſerve, that the ſociety of Jeſus was raiſed by Almighty God to oppoſe them.

So it happen's, whether with deſign, or accidentally, that moſt of the omiſſions, you complain of, regard your ſociety. Had I taken upon me to give a particular account of the inſtitution of your order, 'tis probable I ſhould

have made the obſervation, you mention; as I wou'd have done, upon the like occaſion, in ſpeaking of the *Dominicans* and *Franciſcans*; whom God raiſed up to oppoſe the *Albigenſes*, and other hereticks of the middle ages. But as my deſign was only to give an account of perſons, I omitted ſeveral good obſervations, that might have been made to the credit of every Order reſpectively. But this deficiency is abundantly ſupplied by thoſe of your party, who never omit to do yourſelves juſtice, when your merits are to be diſplayed. And, tho' I cannot diſcommend your labours in that way; yet I take many of your writers to be too aſſuming, when they attribute ſo much to their order, as if the *Jeſuits* were the chief champions able to engage with the enemies of the church. The ſucceſs of God's cauſe does not depend upon particular ſocieties of men; but upon the promiſes made to the prelates, and paſtors, whom Chriſt has appointed to rule and govern his church. 'Tis true, you have labour'd in the cauſe both by your learning and virtue. So have others: and, if I may be permitted to make a compariſon with reſpect to our own country; I believe, the *Clergy* will make an unrivaled figure both with their martyrs, and learned writings: which will be a convincing proof, that they alſo were raiſed by God, to oppoſe the modern hereſies. This obſervation perhaps may be as diſpleaſing to you, as my omiſſions.

Page

Page 52.

You pretend, to take your account of the affair from original letters of Dr. Allen, Lewis, *&c.*

Is it not manifeſt, my account of the *Roman* college is from thoſe letters? and that the letters are original? wou'd you have me cram them down your throat, to convince you?

Page 53.

I will ſtate it faithfully from F. Bartoli.

F. *Bartoli* is not a man to be rely'd upon in this affair. He was partial, as being a *Jeſuit*; and unqualified, as wanting good intelligence. If he contradict's original records, he cannot ſtate the queſtion fairly.

Page 53.

Without perceiving it, he [*Dr.* Clenock] *was led away with partiality.*

I cannot tell, how this expreſſion may ſound in the original *Italian* of F. *Bartoli*; but in the *Engliſh* you give it, it ſound's very oddly; and 'tis the more to be admired, that the whole college ſhou'd plainly ſee the partiality of Dr. *Clenock*, and he be the only one, that cou'd not perceive it.

Page 54.

F. Palma, *and others of the ſociety, ſo moved the Pope, that he call'd thoſe ſeminariſts to him.*

Were you, or your author *Bartoli*, diſpoſed

to relate matters fairly, you ſhou'd have ſaid, that the *Jeſuits* eſpouſed the cauſe of the rebellious, and ejected ſtudents, and repreſented their caſe favourably to the Pope, *viz.* that they were willing to return to the college, upon condition that Dr. *Clenock* might be diſcarded, and a *Jeſuit* made ſuperior in his place. This is the plain meaning of thoſe original records I have met with, the ſubſtance whereof you ſeem not to deny.

Page 55.

It was Mr. Sherwin, *who, about two years after, ſo highly honour'd the church by his glorious death.*

You may juſtly commend him for his glorious death; and, if you pleaſe, for his opinion of your ſociety, and his deſire of being under their government: but I hope, you will not praiſe him for his diſobedience to his ſuperior Dr. *Clenock*, or to the *Cardinal Protector*, and *Pope*, by whoſe orders he was ejected out of the college. Queſtionleſs, he atoned for this and other offences, before his death.

Page 55.

The general of the ſociety was unwilling to undertake the charge.

Such contrivances to obtain it, ſuch joy to poſſeſs it, ſuch pains to continue it, will not permit me to think the general was in earneſt.

Page 56.

And were all diſmiſſed from the college.

Not

Not were *diſmiſſed*, but *left* the college; which they might do upon as good motives, as thoſe that left it when Dr. *Clenock* was preſident.

Page 56.

Only the ſeven Welſhmen *refuſed the oath.*

This is an odious reflexion, and falſe. Several of the ſtudents returned to *Rheims*, and took the Miſſioners oath. Several, that never took the oath, were very worthy miſſioners.

Page 56.

In the ſpace of thirteen years, no leſs than three hundred Engliſh, *many of them perſons of conſiderable note, who came to* Rome *out of curioſity or upon buſineſs, were converted to the catholick faith by the pious examples and diſcourſes of thoſe in the ſeminary.*

This you mention as an effect of the clergy's education under the *Jeſuits*. I am willing to believe, they were well educated; and that their example and diſcourſes were very prevailing; but when you talk of three hundred *Engliſh* being converted in *Rome* only, I am afraid you are very much out in your account.

Page 57.

You are pleaſed to ſay, the Pope employed two eminent Clergymen, Dr. Allen *and Dr.* Lewis, *to model it.* [The *Roman* college.]

You ſeem to queſtion this, by ſaying, it was modell'd by the protector cardinal *Moroni*. Indeed the bull of erection was directed to the cardinal

cardinal by the Pope: So that all in their way concurred in the work. But the modelling moſt properly was Dr. *Allen*'s, who ſent up ſtudents, with the ſame rules, he had eſtabliſhed, in his college at *Rheims*; and Dr. *Lewis*'s, who furniſh'd the houſe with a library and other conveniences. But you are eager at nibbling at any thing, that will leſſen the reputation of the clergy.

Page 59.

Where could the clergy be ſupplied with ſuch tutors at an eaſier rate?

Many will think, tutors of their own body would have been full as proper; and perhaps at a leſs rate, tho' not ſo much to the advantage of the *Jeſuits*.

Page 59.

Let Dr. Allen *tell you his ſentiments of the maſters and government of the ſociety, particularly with regard to the ſeminaries wherein the* Engliſh *were educated.*

Among many other things, that diſcover the want of judgment in a writer, one is, not to diſtinguiſh between times, and times; and to repreſent things in ſuch a manner, as if a perſon would be always of the ſame opinion in regard of the controverſies of life, tho' ſeveral circumſtances afterwards happened, that would oblige him to alter his opinion. This is Dr. *Allen*'s caſe. You have been careful in collecting ſeveral of his expreſſions in commendation of your ſociety, and the excellency of your management in the education of youth; and all this with a reflexion

reflexion upon me, as if I had not done you the like juſtice. Now I am ſo far from differing from that worthy clergyman, that I agree with him in all he ſays in your commendation, *viz.* That your order was remarkably ſerviceable to the cauſe of religion: That you abounded with perſons of great virtue, and learning: That none were better qualified for the education of youth: That the clergy were in a particular manner obliged to ſhew their gratitude, for your aſſiſting 'em upon ſeveral occaſions; and that Dr. *Allen* was very well content, when the *Roman* college was placed under the government of perſons of your order. But what is all this to the point we are about? The queſtion is not, what was Dr. *Allen*'s opinion at that time; but what opinion he would have been of, had he lived to ſee the after-games that were played. Not that he would have alter'd his opinion as to the reſpect he had for your *ſociety*, or the qualifications of your teachers in the education of youth. Both I, and all other clergymen at this day, do join with him in thoſe ſentiments. But as to the inconveniences, and abuſes; and the advantages that were made of a *heterogeneous education*, to the diſcredit of the clergy, I believe any equitable judge will think, he would have altered his opinion in that reſpect. Had he lived to ſee the miſmanagement of the *Roman college:* ſo few miſſioners ſent, bearing no proportion with ſo plentiful a foundation, and many that were ſent, ſo very meanly qualified: Had he ſeen the havock, that

that was made in the college at *Doway:* ancient doctors, and profeſſors obliged to leave it; the ſcholars ordered to frequent the *Jeſuits* ſchools; a *Jeſuit* purpoſely entertained to be their confeſſor, as if no clergyman had been fit for the office: Had he ſeen petitions in favour of epiſcopal government, diſcountenanced and rejected: the ſcheme of an arch-prieſt take place, by the ſuggeſtion of thoſe, who had private views in that contrivance: This arch-prieſt to receive his inſtructions from the *Jeſuits*, in what regarded the government of the clergy: No ſcholar to be admitted into the college at *Doway*, without the approbation of this arch-prieſt, or the ſuperior of the *Jeſuits:* And, when this arch-prieſt, your creature, was depoſed, and another not ſo plyable, choſen in his place, had Cardinal *Allen* lived to ſee the attempts, that were continued againſt the intereſt of the clergy: Agents ſent to *Rome* by the arch-prieſt, and the whole body of the clergy croſs'd and diſappointed in every thing they propoſed for the good of their body, and perſonally traduced by malicious miſrepreſentations; by which tricks their complaints were either never heard, or little attended to: Had the good cardinal lived to ſee theſe doings, do you think he would have had the ſame opinion of the management of the colleges, he formerly had? No; no: he certainly would have altered his opinion, as the good arch-prieſt *Birket* did, when he remonſtrated againſt thoſe inconveniences and abuſes, which were not foreſeen by Cardinal *Allen*, nor ſo much

much as ſuſpected; but at laſt, detected by this arch-prieſt, who tho' he had a particular affection for your order, and an uncommon intimacy with F. *Parſons*, ſo as to conſult him upon many occaſions relating to the government of the clergy; yet finding, by experience, that all his advice tended towards their prejudice, he took ſuch meaſures, as prevented the like inconvenience for the future.

Page 61.

There is good reaſon to have the body of the Engliſh *ſecular clergy kept up well furniſhed with able men.*

As a means to effect this, you think the bull of *Alexander* VII. prohibiting you and other regulars from entertaining the clergy, was a wiſe proviſion. But murmuring at that decree, and making uſe of ſo many ſtratagems to bring thoſe over to become *Jeſuits*, who intended to be clergymen, was no token, that you were inclined to enter into the ſentiments of the See of *Rome*; but rather, that your deſign was to thin the clergy of all able men. And therefore your eyes were chiefly upon thoſe, that had either parts, or purſe, or were of great families, eſpecially elder brothers.

Page 62.

This looks very much like a hint at leaſt, that the revenues were turned to the advantage of the ſociety by a wrong application.

That the managing of the revenues of the college was an advantage to your ſociety, is

pretty plain: And has any of you ever made it appear probable, that there was no wrong application, when from ſo ample and noble a foundation the clergy received ſo little, ſo inconſiderable a ſupply?

Page 62.

The Jeſuits, *by the bull for inſtituting that college, were to give twice a year an account of the management of the revenues.*

Do they comply with this order? Whence then ariſe ſo many complaints concerning the management of the college, both as to diſcipline and revenues? Why are particular viſitations appointed to inſpect matters? Is there not a great overplus in the revenues above what is expended in educating the ſtudents? I believe you are reſponſible for the arrears; and, if I am not miſinformed, have been obliged to refund. They are alive, who remember, how cardinal *Norfolk* handled you upon a deficiency in accounts.

Page 63.

The two Italian Jeſuits *were, as you expreſs it, for overthrowing the original intent of the founders of that houſe.*

The original intent of the founder was, that it ſhould be a houſe of entertainment for the *Saxons*, that travelled to *Rome*; eſpecially for ſuch, as were in neceſſity; and lands were purchaſed by the *Saxon* kings *Inas* and *Offa*, for that purpoſe. Our hiſtorians give it different names: *viz.* a *School*, a *Hoſpital*; and *Matthew*

of

of *Weſtminſter*, as you ſay, call's it a *College*. It was twice burnt, and collections made in *England* towards rebuilding it; and, as I find, part of the tax called *Peterpence* was employed towards repairing the loſſes. Thus it continued till the breach between *Henry* VIII. and the See of *Rome*. Afterwards, the Pope ſeem's to have taken the adminiſtration upon him. The firſt of queen *Eliſabeth* it was called the *Engliſh Hoſpital*, and Sir *Edward Kern* was the *Cuſtos* or Superior. When, ſome years after, the project was compleated to make it a college for *Engliſh* miſſioners, with an additional fund from the Pope, and Dr. *Clenock* was appointed preſident, he thought it a hardſhip, that Biſhop *Godwell* and ſome others, who had a maintenance there, ſhould be removed. In this he was oppoſed by the two *Jeſuits*. How the Pope ordered matters, as to the old revenues, I cannot tell: but that his orders were obeyed, is certain. Is this account either aſperſing the Pope, or the *Jeſuits*? or a ſufficient ground for that diſmal exclamation, *unhappy writer! when will you learn to ſpare the* Jeſuits, *&c.*

Page 64.

In a manner all the colleges in Rome *for other nations, are under the education of the* Jeſuits: *muſt this education be heterogeneous with regard to the* Engliſh *only?*

I diſpute neither the power nor the prudence of his Holyneſs in placing *Jeſuits* over thoſe colleges of *Foreigners*. The greateſt prudence

cannot foreſee the inconveniences and abuſes, that may happen. As for other colleges, whoſe affairs I am a ſtranger to, I cannot be poſitive, what has happened in that way: but, as I am informed, there have been, and ſtill are great complaints. But as for the *Engliſh college*, the inconveniences, and abuſes are undeniable matters of fact. Beſides, the *Jeſuits*, that ſupervise thoſe other colleges, may be of a different make from the *Engliſh*. They may not be ſo pragmatical and enterpriſing; nor have made ſo many attempts in prejudice of the clergy they govern.

Page 64.

But the truth of the matter is, that the more frequent the remonſtrances have been, the more numerous are the proofs of the Jeſuits *good conduct; ſince notwithſtanding ſo many attempts, they have been ſo long continued in the charge by ſo many Popes.*

I have read ſeveral remonſtrances and petitions of the *Clergy*, exhibiting their grievances, in order to be relieved. Few of them mentioned the removal of your fathers from the college; and thoſe that did, touch'd it ſo tenderly, that it gave no offence to his *Holyneſs*. But as for all the other complaints mention'd in thoſe remonſtrances (which I have given you a liſt of) they were judged to be ſo rational, that his *Holyneſs* was willing to have abuſes redreſſed to the ſatisfaction of the *Clergy*. His *Holyneſs* had no occaſion to give any remonſtrators ſatisfaction, why he continued the *Jeſuits*

in the government of the *Roman college.* Supreme Powers think it a high piece of prudence, to let ſome things go on in their old way, rather than make an alteration, where, perhaps, greater inconveniences may be apprehended. Forbearance, connivence, and tolerations are the practice under many good governments: and the city of *Rome* is not a ſtranger to ſuch kind of methods.

Page 65.

Monaſteries were generally the ſchools of piety, and learning even for the clergy.

This is the remark you make, to ſet forth the advantage the *Engliſh* clergy formerly reaped by being educated under the Regulars with an alluſion to the *Roman college.* I allow, that ſeveral who were deſigned for the clergy, were well inſtructed in the monaſteries in the rudiments of learning and piety. And had not the *Monks*, and all other Regulars as great an Advantage, when they were ſent from their monaſteries to improve themſelves in both our univerſities? If we come down to the latter ages and preſent times, are there not *colleges* and *ſeminaries* in every *dioceſe* and *city*, where the clergy are educated under ſuperiors of their own body, which are nurſeries from whence the Church is furniſh'd daily with eminent *Prelates* and *Paſtors?* And is it not manifeſt, that any other way is a ſingularity, neither neceſſary, nor convenient, when all circumſtances are conſider'd?

Page 66.

Catechiſing, preaching, and miſſions, are not theſe proper functions for a clergyman?

Yes certainly. But are not clergymen capable of preparing their own ſubjects for thoſe functions?

Page 66.

Are not the Jeſuits *by the council of* Trent, *and bulls of ſeveral Popes, declared to be of the clergy?*

Yes: it is true; and at the ſame time, they are declared to be *Regulars*; and it happen's very luckily, that upon ſome ſerviceable occaſions, they reap the benefit of that double character.

Page 66.

Clement *the eighth called the Society* Brachium dextrum eccleſiæ.

You may, perhaps, take ſome vanity in the complement: and it cou'd be no more than a complement, unleſs he deſigned to make the *Biſhops, Clergy*, and all other religious orders, only *Brachium ſiniſtrum eccleſiæ.*

Page 67.

And ſure you will bluſh to find how you differ from his [*Dr.* Allen's] *ſpirit, or from his language at leaſt, if not from his ſentiments.*

We both agree in having a great reſpect for your order; in a grateful acknowledgement of the aſſiſtance you gave to the clergy, when you firſt ſent miſſioners into *England*; in your being excellent

excellent inſtructors of youth; in the hope there was, that the *Engliſh Jeſuits* wou'd govern the *Roman College* ſo, as not to be detrimental to the clergy. The only thing we differ in, is, that he cou'd not foreſee, what the clergy afterwards experienc'd, and I have proved to be rue; and in this he wou'd have been of my opinion, had he lived to ſee the inconveniences, and abuſes that happened.

Page 70.

The expreſſion import's, that the faction you mention flow's from the nature of the education, which the Popes have continued ſo long.

Not from the nature of the education; which might have had better effects: but from the contrivances and management of thoſe, who projected matters, that naturally tended to breed faction. And tho' the Pope approved of the education, he did not approve of every inconvenience and abuſe, that flowed from miſmanagement: otherwiſe he wou'd not have redreſſed ſo many evils upon remonſtrances made by the clergy.

Page 71.

What rules, again, permit you to imply, that the ſupreme authority is ſo imprudent, as to continue a ſource of ſcandalous faction, and conteſt?

When you find yourſelf at a loſs, in the way of argument, you commonly have recourſe to power, eſpecially to the *Pope*; and find it much to your purpoſe to repreſent me as guilty

of diſreſpect to his *Holyneſs*. Does the *Pope* approve of the miſcarriages of all thoſe, that act by commiſſion from him? I queſtion not his prudence in continuing you ſuperiors of the *Roman* College; nor will I pretend to judge of his reaſons for the continuation. I ſuppoſe, your general, being ready at hand upon all occaſions, make's them appear both juſt, and prudent. I have already accounted for it in general, when I told you, ſupreme powers thought it a piece of high prudence, to let ſome things go on rather, than attempt an alteration, where greater miſchief may be apprehended; not that he, or any one elſe, look's upon that ſort of education, as the immediate occaſion of faction; which is properly aſcribed to miſmanagement. And, as you have been obliged to correct ſome things, he may continue you in hopes of a farther amendment.

Page 72.

Very great numbers of the Engliſh *clergy, and of it's moſt eminent men, have been educated under the* Jeſuits.

If this remark be for your purpoſe, 'tis no leſs for mine, when 'tis obſerv'd, that many, and thoſe the moſt eminent *Jeſuits*, have not only had their education among the clergy, but were actually conſiderable men of that body, before they were incorporated in your's; as a liſt, I have given of ſome of them, is a ſufficient proof. But after all; is the education on either ſide according to the rules of the beſt oeconomy? As the ſuperiors of the clergy, who inſtruct

inſtruct you, may not be acquainted with all the ſecrets of your order; ſo the clergy, that are inſtructed by you, may have many notions inſtill'd into them, not very favourable to their body.

Page 74, 75.

On your life of father Thomas Derbyſhire *——were ſuch particulars as theſe to be entirely omitted?*

I have ſaid as much of this worthy man, as my deſign'd brevity, in writing lives, would permit. All I ſay of him is very much in his commendation. But oh! the unpardonable fault of omiſſion, when the merits of ſome perſons are not expreſs'd at full! I have omitted ſeveral particulars relating to father *Derbyſhire*, viz. a ſtrange man appearing to him, when the door of his chamber was ſhut, exhorting him to become a *Jeſuit*: A crucifix bleeding, which put him in mind of ſuffering martyrdom: His being miraculouſly cured of a diſtemper by the Apoſtles: The revelation, he had from the bleſſed *Virgin Mary*, that *Claudius Aquaviva* wou'd be choſen general of the *Jeſuits*. I am no ſtranger to the doctrine of the church concerning miracles; or what ought to be the behaviour of every prudent perſon, when they are reported. Is there any crime, or diſreſpect, in not believing miracles that are not declared authentick, according to the canons of the church? Is there any crime in omitting, or ſuſpending a man's opinion, as to miracles

reported by writers either unkown, or known to be too credulous?

Page 77.

Page 1. *You ſay the enemies of the old religion were a conſiderable party, and page* 2, *they are many: whereas page* 7. *they are an inconſiderable number.*

You labour very hard, to charge me with inconſiſtences; but are always unſucceſsful. Upon the preſent occaſion, you might have done me juſtice, had you conſider'd, how I make the enemies of the old religion in *Queen Mary*'s reign conſiderable, and inconſiderable. They were conſiderable as to number, tho' not in appearance; becauſe they concealed themſelves under occaſional conformity. When I make them inconſiderable, I only ſpeak of thoſe, that fled out of *England* and retired to *Frankford*, *Straſbourg*, *Geneva*, and other places abroad. Cou'd you bluſh, you might be aſham'd of ſo palpable, and notorious a miſrepreſentation.

Page 77.

It is evident, ſhe could be no more the one than the other.

'Tis not material, what opinion either you or I are of, as to the difference between *Head* and *Governour*. 'Tis certain, moſt of the *Reformers* abroad made a great difference by their bitter exclamations againſt the title of *Head*, tho' at the ſame time they reliſh'd very well that of *Governour*.

Page

Page 77.

Reducing it [*the common Prayer*] *to the ſame form, and yet altering it, is again very far from accuracy.*

Doe's pulling down a partition wall, or adding a cloſet, deſtroy the form of a building? Did the number of corrections in the *Bible* alter the form of God's word. The *Reformers* of Queen *Eliſabeth*'s reign, and thoſe of *Edward* VI's kept the ſame form of common Prayer. Such an expreſſion is both true, and accurate: nor wou'd any one, but a *Triſler*, pretend to quarrel with it.

Page 78.

That the matter [*of corporal preſence*] *was left undetermin'd, as a ſpeculative point, in which people were at their liberty.*

Theſe are *Echard*'s words, giving an account why Queen *Eliſabeth*'s divines left out the declaration againſt a corporal preſence. But how am I concerned, who am perſwaded, it was not a point, wherein the people ought to be left to their liberty? But oh! the crying offence of omiſſion! I ſhould have ſaid, what you would have ſaid upon the occaſion.

Page 78.

How could you ſay, that the articles of prayers in an unknown tongue, and the authority of a national church in ceremonies, were ſcarce a matter of conteſt.

Matters

Matters of diſcipline have always been look'd upon with another eye, than articles of faith. Prayer in this or that language was never regarded as an article of faith. The ſame may be ſaid of ceremonies; which often are different in different nations, whom the church does not oblige to a conformity in any, unleſs they are preſcribed by divine inſtitution. So that comparatively ſpeaking, thoſe matters of diſcipline cou'd ſcarce be eſteem'd a ſubject of contention, at a time, when ſeveral capital articles of faith were firſt to be diſcuſſed.

Page 79.

What ſort of a catholick divine can he be, who makes it a query, whether, or rather implie's, that full allegiance to ſovereigns is not conſiſtent with the belief of a ſpiritual headſhip in any, who are not alſo temporal ſovereigns?

You have no regard to the nature of the *Query*, which is only directed to thoſe proteſtant divines, who pretend to a ſpiritual ſupremacy, whereby they are made independent of the civil power; a ſyſtem, they cannot maintain; ſeeing they are obliged to acknowledge a ſpiritual ſupremacy in the civil power. How my query give's occaſion to your abuſive remark, let the reader judge.

Page 80.

Did not gratitude require, ſome notice ſhould be taken?

'Tis not in my power to ſay enough, when ſome-

ſome thing more is always expected, as due; the leaſt omiſſion is an unpardonable fault.'

Page 82.

Doe's an impartial hiſtorian thus vary, and ſo ſoon?

Your pretended variation, and, as you call it, inconſiſtence, is: firſt, that I attribute Dr. *Clenock*'s being made preſident of the *Roman College* to Dr. *Lewis*; and ſoon after, I attribute his promotion to the *Pope* or *Cardinal Protector*. Where is the inconſiſtence, if the Pope, or Cardinal gave Dr. *Lewis* the liberty to nominate him? Is not this your own way of expreſſing things of this kind, when you mention the orders, you execute, as regulations coming from the *Pope*, or Cardinal *Protector*? Again you are pleaſed to ſay, I call the alteration of the hoſpital into a college an overthrowing of the original intent of the founders. You know very well, this is an impoſition. I only relate, what diſpute happened between Dr. *Clenock* and the two *Jeſuits*. The *Doctor* thought it a hardſhip, that biſhop *Godwell*, and about twelve more, who had a maintenance from the ancient revenues, ſhould be turned out; and alledged, it was overthrowing the original intention of the *Founders*. How this affair was managed, I cannot tell. But I ſuppoſe, the Pope took care, that the complainants ſhould not be ſufferers. I don't find, that Dr. *Allen* is mentioned on this occaſion; and if he were, it does not imply any inconſiſtence in me, when

when I make him the propoſer of the new eſtabliſhment, and one that ſtood up for a maintenance of thoſe, that claim'd it by the original intention of the founders of the hoſpital.

Page 83.

The Engliſh Jeſuits *as yet not being form'd into a diſtinct body.*

I have ſufficiently acknowledged, and expreſſed F. *Parſons*'s zeal for religion, and affection for the clergy miſſioners, in being ſo inſtrumental in erecting colleges for the education of clergymen at *Valladolid*, *Sevil*, and St. *Omer*'s. If afterwards, when the *Jeſuits* became a diſtinct body, thoſe colleges ſerv'd alſo as nurſeries for their order, I don't pretend it was turning the revenues to a wrong uſe, (every one being at liberty to embrace what ſtate of life he pleas'd.) But that it was a good opportunity of encreaſing your number, and engaging pickt men for your ſociety, is a reflexion, that cannot well be paſſed over in ſilence; and that your management in that affair is at leaſt the innocent occaſion of the leſs proſperous condition of the clergy.

Page 86.

Can it ſound well in you to ſay the clergy are great ſufferers by his (the Pope's) oeconomy?

They were not ſufferers by the oeconomy, but by the abuſe of it. Can it look well in you, to defend the abuſes, which his Holyneſs thought

thought fit to redreſs upon the remonſtrances made by the clergy?

Page 87.

Nor do I know, what you mean by making the Jeſuits *and Clergy be of different intereſts in the controverſies of life.*

Are you the only ſtranger in *Iſrael?* Did you never hear of perſons being of different intereſts in domeſtick affairs? Wou'd you have me run up to *Adam* to give you inſtances? You may be fully inform'd of ſuch matters nearer home. I own, the intereſt is the ſame in regard of religion: but there is a *meum and tuum*, that ſometimes render's that divine motto, *Ad majorem dei gloriam*, inſignificant. There were ſo many humane conſiderations in the controverſies between the *Jeſuits* and Clergy, that to ſay, *they had the ſame intereſt in view*, is an impoſition upon human underſtanding.

Page 89.

Before I examine your account of the Wiſbich *affair, I will ſtate it fairly from* Bartoli and Juvency.

I have already alledged ſeveral reaſons, why *Bartoli* and *Juvency* are not to be rely'd upon in other accounts, much leſs in this; where they are remarkably partial and ſcurrilous to the higheſt degree. On the other hand, the account I give, is from manuſcripts of perſons of the beſt character, and eye-witneſſes to what happened. Not that I make myſelf a party,

to pronounce upon the merits of the cauſe; and much leſs do I approve of the paſſions of thoſe who thought themſelves injured.

Page 89.

The firſt had been ſent away from Rome *for his miſbehaviour; and, contrary to the Pope's expreſs order, procured to be doctor of divinity, more by money, than by learning.*

This is the character given of Dr. *Bagſhaw*, an eminent and venerable clergyman. As for his being ſent away from the *Roman* college, I can give you a liſt of ſeveral other eminent clergymen, ſent away out of the college, only for the grand miſbehaviour of wanting a remarkable zeal for your ſociety. As for the prohibition, that miſſioners ſhould not take degrees, we know very well the tendency of it, and who ſuffered by it. That it was not learning, but money, that promoted him, is an abuſive character contrary to truth and good manners. He had been principal or vice-principal of *Glouceſter-hall* in *Oxford*, before he was converted; of great ſkill in the *Greek* language; commended by doctor *Featley*, a Proteſtant divine, upon account of a learned conference he had with him, as one of the *veterani milites* of the church of *Rome*; in fine, ſo eſteem'd by his brethren and others, that the *Benedictin* monks thought him worthy of a mitre. What credit can be given to your honeſt and impartial Hiſtorians, who paint him out in the colours they have done? Are ſuch hiſtorians to

be

be rely'd upon, in the account they give of the affair of *Wiſbich Caſtle*, when they endeavour to aſperſe Dr. *Bagſhaw* as the principal perſon, who oppoſed the attempts of the *Jeſuits?*

Page 90.

It was thought proper to chuſe a ſuperior: eighteen of them unanimoſly agreed in chuſing Father Weſton.

It manifeſtly appear's, from the circumſtances of both accounts, that there was a ſcheme laid, that the clergy in *Wiſbich-Caſtle* ſhould be governed by a *Jeſuit*; and that it was oppoſed by the ancient and moſt conſiderable men of the clergy then priſoners. It is no leſs manifeſt, that your hiſtorians are both partial and unjuſt, when they give ſuch ſcandalous characters of the clergymen, that oppoſed the deſign. Whether the motives for this ſcheme was only zeal for religion, or had a mixture of ſome temporal conſiderations, I will not pretend to determine; much leſs do I juſtify the paſſion and extravagant behaviour of any one, that oppoſed your party.

Page 92.

Nor was Father Weſton *the only* Jeſuit *in that priſon: there were three others.*

Were thoſe three others *Jeſuits* at that time? Were they not *Jeſuits in voto* only, admitted into the order at the hour of their death? I find ſeveral upon the liſt of your ſociety, who always were accounted clergymen, till

till you ſtruck them out of the catalogue of the clergy, by admitting them a little before they died.

Page 93.

Nor do you make any complement to thoſe, whom you thus repreſent as apprehending, that regularity might be prejudicial to the clergy.

Nothing could induce you to caſt out ſuch reflecting words, but the inclination you have to believe, that regularity is peculiar to your order; and not to be expected among the clergy. Thoſe, that oppoſed your attempts in *Wisbich-caſtle*, were not enemies to regularity; but to the ſecret deſigns concealed under it. It will ſcarce be believed, that amongſt almoſt forty clergymen, not one ſhould be found fit to be a ſuperior. This objection was made by your opponents: and therefore, declining the ſuperiorſhip, you wiſely propoſed a clergyman, a fit tool for your purpoſe.

Page 94.

You repreſent Dryland [*a clergyman*] *a man of no extraordinary qualifications: the leſs likely man for a deſign.*

Any body elſe would think him the moſt likely man to become a tool: eſpecially if great politicians were his inſtructors, and ſtood behind the ſcenes to prompt him.

Page

Page 96.

I will relate it chiefly from Bartoli, *and* Juvency.

I have already given ſo many reaſons for ſetting aſide theſe Hiſtorians, that I wonder you will mention them, as to the account they give of the *Arch-prieſt*; ſeeing, that every time you have recourſe to them, you make new diſcoveries of their incapacity; and more particularly upon this occaſion, where the whole of their Story is ſupported by ignorance, miſrepreſentation, groundleſs and contradictory conjectures. And when all the accuſations are ſummed up, they never reach the heart of the cauſe; but only ſhew their evil diſpoſitions in expoſing the perſonal irregularities of ſome few, that defended it.

Page 98.

Some of the Clergy began to enter into a project.

This whimſical project is entirely fictitious, as you relate it. *viz.* They were about chuſing among themſelves, two ſuperiors; one for the North, another for the South, with a power of giving or refuſing leave to hear confeſſions, even to the *Regulars*; and this without any regard to the *Pope*; who, to prevent this project, placed over them an *Arch-prieſt*. Now this whole account is ridiculous and inconſiſtent. The intention of thoſe clergymen was to procure two *Biſhops*, one for the North, the other for the South: and to effect this matter, they petitioned the *Pope*. Was this a project carri-

ed on among themſelves without regard to the *Pope?* Or did it it import that they would uſurp any other power, as to confeſſion, than what was agreeable to the *Pope's ordinances?* I own the Pope did not hearken to the propoſal of having biſhops; as being of opinion, that the ſcheme of an arch-prieſt wou'd give leſs offence to the miniſtry. But that the Pope eſtabliſhed this oeconomy to baffle any dangerous project of the clergy, is an inconſiſtent ſpeculation.

Page 96.

He made Mr. Blackwell *be conſtituted arch-prieſt by a letter of the Cardinal protector—— becauſe a letter from the Cardinal might not be ſo apt to be ſo rigorouſly minded by the civil government as a Bull, and Breve from the Pope.*

You often complain, that I omit to make proper reflexions, and don't conſider this thing and t'other. I will now make an obſervation, which will ſet the reader right in the caſe of the arch-prieſt. You own he was firſt conſtituted by the *Cardinal's* letter, and not by any *Breve* or *Bull* from the *Pope.* Might not the clergy make ſome difference between the Cardinal's letter, and an expreſs *decree* from the Pope? eſpecially when an unuſual œconomy was eſtabliſhed, regarding a national church, and the Cardinal's letter lyable to ſeveral exceptions, as miſinformations, &c. Was it any crime, or uncanonical way of proceeding, to appeal to the Pope, to have ſuſpicions removed,

and

nd the Cardinal's letter confirm'd by a ſpecial decree of his Holineſs?

Page 97.

Some of the Clergy finding themſelves diſappointed in their expectations of being of the number [*of aſſiſtants*] *began to queſtion the authority.*

I ſcarce think, that the clergy would lay themſelves ſo open to cenſure, as to ſignify either directly, or indirectly, that they were induced by that motive to queſtion the authority. Their appeal will inform you of the true motives; that, which you mention, is an effect of ill nature and fiction.

Page 97.

They firſt conſulted the matter with the queen's miniſters.

This is a ſcandalous inconſiſtent reflexion, as you would apply it. By the miniſtry (or by ſome other means) they were favour'd with their freedom from priſon. There was an occaſion of conſulting with the miniſtry on that head. The matter, they went next upon, was to be heard at *Rome.* Cou'd the miniſtry be ſerviceable to them upon this account? Did they hold a correſpondence with the Pope, or had they any intereſt with him?

Page 97.

Who [*the miniſtry*] *ordered biſhop* Bancroft *to help the appellants, as much as he could; that he did it ſo openly, as to converſe with them in publick, and have ſome of them in his houſe:*

that Mr. Bluet *privately conferred with the queen: that ſhe recommended the apellants to ſeveral of her agents abroad: that* Bluet, Bagſhaw, Champney, *and* Barneby, *were releaſed out of priſon by her order.*

This is the account you give from *Juvency*; a writer not only to be ſuſpected, but not to be rely'd upon, as I have ſhewn before. However, ſince Proteſtant hiſtorians confirm one part of his relation; I will conſider the whole. And firſt, in order to ſet this matter in a true light, and diſtinguiſh between the odious and falſe inſinuations of the writer, and what might be juſtly allowed of; it will be requiſite to conſider, how far *Catholicks* may be permitted to correſpond with the enemies of the church, and what relation ſuch correſpondence has to ſome of the appealing clergy. A reſolution upon the following query's will contribute towards the reader's ſatisfaction upon this affair.

Is it a crime to correſpond with hereticks in the way of trade, or apply to them as jugdes of civil rights?

Cannot Catholicks make an intereſt with a Proteſtant miniſtry, to be releaſed from an unjuſt confinement?

When Catholicks want neceſſaries or conveniences to carry on their reſpective affairs, is there any harm in being ſupplied by Proteſtants?

Who will accuſe thoſe clergymen of injuſtice or imprudence, who obtained their liberty in order to be heard in perſon by his Holineſs,

lineſs, in a caſe, which they ſuſpected was miſrepreſented?

If the miniſters favoured thoſe clergymen with their liberty upon account of their more unqueſtionable principles of loyalty, or in order to foment faction between them and the *Jeſuits*, were the clergy chargeable with the wrong and evil motives of the miniſtry.

Are recommendatory letters to ambaſſadors any more, than what is uſual? or is it a token that any thing is carrying on againſt the intereſt of Catholicks?

Can no other conſtruction be put upon Mr. *Bluet's* converſing with the queen, than that he imparted to her all the ſecrets of the *Appellants* And is it not a raſhneſs to affirm, that the ambaſſadors abroad were inform'd of every thing that paſſed at *Rome* in that affair?

The laſt query is, whether the correſpondence ſome of the appealing clergy had with the miniſtry, had not an evil aſpect; and was not ſcandalous in the eye of many catholicks, who might have a good opinion of their cauſe in the main?

'Tis not my buſineſs to make any declaration upon theſe queries: much leſs do I juſtify the errors, they may be accuſed of by ſuch a way of proceeding. I leave it to the reader to determine, how far thoſe *appealing Clergy* were able to defend themſelves. Meantime thoſe, that are reſolved to condemn them for correſponding with queen *Eliſabeth's* miniſtry, if they will talk conſiſtently, muſt anſwer for the

correſpondence certain miſſioners held with the Emperor of *China*, when the Pope's legate (who cou'd not reliſh ſome of their ways) was clapt up in priſon: As alſo for the correſpondence ſome *Engliſh* miſſioners held with the miniſtry, in king *Charles the firſt's* reign, and other reigns, in order to oppoſe *epiſcopal Government* among the Catholicks in *England*.

Page 98.

To go to Rome *to proſecute the appeal, notwithſtanding the particular laws againſt appeals to* Rome.

How can this medley of ſtuff be made palatable, or digeſted by any one, that has the uſe of his reaſon? Either the *Queen* and Miniſtry did not concur to this appeal, or they acted in open defiance to the laws of the nation; which ſome will think incredible. If the matter was conceal'd from them, how can this be reconciled to what your *Author* affirm's, that the appealing clergy communicated the affair with all the particulars, that happened at *Rome*, to the *Ambaſſadors* abroad, and to the *Queen*, Miniſtry, and biſhop *Bancroft* at home? The circumſtances plainly prove the account to be fictitious.

Page 98.

They were invited by F. Parſons *to take their abode in the Roman college: That they refuſed.*

It may ſeem ſtrange, that F. *Parſons* ſhould invite ſuch ſcandalous perſons to reſide in the college; but not at all ſtrange that they refuſed the invitation, conſidering that cou'd expect no

real friendſhip from him, and that he was diſpoſed to undermine them in what they came about.

Page 100.

They were a flock without a Paſtor.

You are ſcandalized at this expreſſion, and alledge by way of reply, that the *Pope* was their *Paſtor*. The Pope is own'd to be the *Chief Paſtor* of the univerſal church: but not the only *Paſtor*. The flock cannot be ſufficiently taken care of, without the aſſiſtance of other more immediate *Paſtors*. There were many Paſtors of the ſacerdotal order, during the vacancy I ſpoke of; but no Paſtors of the *Epiſcopal Order*, to anſwer that divine inſtitution, either with reſpect to the *Laity*, who were deprived of the ſacrament of confirmation; or to the *Clergy*, who had no body to preſide over them, and inſpect their conduct. Theſe were the complaints of the *Primitive Chriſtians*, when their biſhops were taken from them; and no apprehenſion of perſecution was thought a ſufficient motive, to neglect that diſcipline. But in theſe latter days, our predeceſſors and we have lived to ſee leſs allowable motives judged ſufficient to diſregard, if not to oppoſe *Epiſcopal Government*. There is no occaſion to mention thoſe motives. The ſtruggles, that have been made to cramp epiſcopal juriſdiction, ſo as almoſt to render it inſignificant, are a plain demonſtration, how ſome perſons ſtood affected; and how well they would have been pleas'd, to have ſeen another *Anarchy* amongſt the clergy. But

'tis to be hoped, they are now better inſtructed, than to ſuffer their adverſaries to play another *Blackwell* upon them.

Page 100.

That F. Parſons *came willingly into the prje ct of having Biſhops.*

All this I own; but he alter'd his opinion, when he found, he could make a better hand of an *Arch-Prieſt.*

Page 101.

Should oppoſe Mr. Blackwell *as unfit for the dignity, (of Arch-Prieſt) ſince he was one among thoſe, whom they themſelves had named, as proper perſons to be made Biſhops.*

I don't find any exceptions were made againſt him, as unqualified for either dignity. His unfitneſs was of another kind. The head of the clergy ought to have a regard to their intereſt; but it appear's from his behaviour, that he was entirely under the direction of the *Jeſuits.*

Page 101.

They even pretend, the Cardinal's letter, conſtituting the Arch-Prieſt, was written by F. Parſons, *to whom he had given leave to draw it up, as he pleaſed.*

I cannot tell, how far the appealing Clergy were able to bring proofs for this particular. But from the contents, and many circumſtances of that affair, ſtrong conjectures may be made, that the *Jeſuits* had a hand in that letter, and particularly

particularly F. *Parſons*, the chief *Engliſhman* of that order; who, by all accounts, was always conſulted by the Cardinal in things regarding the *Engliſh* miſſion. Why was the Arch-prieſt order'd, by the conſtituent letter, to adviſe with the *Jeſuits* in the government of the Clergy? why did the *Jeſuits* publiſh ſo many books to ſupport the Arch-prieſt againſt the appealing Clergy? Did they not, upon all occaſions, defend his cauſe, as if it had been their own?

Page 101.

For both (the Pope and Cardinal) declared, that the firſt conſtitutive letter was made by the protector, and the authority of his holyneſs.

I don't find, that this was denied by the appealing Clergy. They knew very well, that the Cardinal had his commiſſion from the Pope: and that the Pope afterwards declared, that *appointing an Arch-prieſt* was within the limits of the commiſſion. But ſtill there was room for an appeal. The appellants ſuſpected, that things were carried by miſinformation: they wanted a farther explanation; and judged, that a matter of ſo great and general a concern might require an expreſs Breve, at leaſt of confirmat on; which the Pope thought fit to iſſue out to the ſatisfaction of the appellants.

Page 103.

Whereas they were but few in compariſon; and far from being the chief of the Clergy.

At the time, when the project of the Arch-

prieſt

prieſt was ſet on foot, the chief of the clergy, and moſt reſpected for years and merit in *England*, were either confin'd in priſon, or oblig'd to abſcond. Others alſo, conſiderable men of the body, lived in *Rome* and other places abroad. Theſe went eaſily into the ſcheme of the Arch-prieſt, being under the influence of the great F. *Parſons*. Thoſe in *England* complain'd, they were never adviſed with, tho' the Cardinal's letter ſeem'd to include them. At firſt, indeed, they were only a few, that ſtarted the difficulty: but they were, ſoon after, followed by numbers; and thoſe the ableſt men of the Clergy, as appear's by their characters.

Page 104.

For he [the Pope] in fine approved of the impriſonment of the two Agents.

There is nothing myſterious in this impriſonment of the two Agents; it being very plain, why, and by whom, the matter was contrived. Theſe two diſobedient Clergymen (for ſo they are deſcribed) were Dr. *William Biſhop*, afterwards biſhop of *Chalcedon*, and Mr. *Charnock* a venerable Clergyman, qualified for the higheſt preferments. They were ſent to *Rome* by their Brethren, to lay their complaints at his holyneſs's feet: but at their arrival were ſeiz'd and impriſon'd by the *Cardinal*'s orders; which you (according to your uſual manner of always bringing in the Pope, by way of ſkreen, to authoriſe what others thought was wrong in his Miniſters) ſay the *Pope* approved of. The Agents were

were ſtrangers to the Pope, as he was to their behaviour; till a bad, and ſcandalous character was given of them, and occaſioned their impriſonment. 'Tis probable, the *Arch-prieſt* ſent their character before 'em; and 'tis more than probable, that F. *Parſons* confirmed that character; and therefore it was agreed, that they ſhould be confin'd in a priſon, where F. *Parſons* was *Goaler*. He knew, what they came about; and would take care, they ſhould do no miſchief.

Page 108.

Implie's they did not juſtly employ them.

This is neither expreſs'd, nor imply'd by my account. I only ſay, the *Jeſuits*, by being ſuperiors of thoſe colleges, had a good opportunity of fitting the ſcholars for their ſociety, which might be without miſapplying the revenues. I need not tell you, what opportunities there were; or how they were made uſe of. I ſay, indeed, that ſome complain'd, the revenues were not juſtly applied; but they might have reaſons, I am a ſtranger to.

Page 109.

If you were acquainted with the conſtitutions of the ſociety, you would know, that the Jeſuits *are forbid to perſuade thoſe, who are under their education, or conduct, to embrace their order.*

I own, I am not ſo well acquainted with the conſtitutions of your order, as I am with the practice of ſome of your members, eſpecially as

as to this particular. If there is any ſuch conſtitution in your order, I applaud it, as I do all the reſt of your conſtitutions. But let me tell you, there never was a more barefaced attempt upon the credulity of your readers, than to make them believe, that you do not prevaricate againſt that good conſtitution. The whole world, in a manner, is convinced, that ſome of you are continually laying baits to draw perſons in.

Page 109.

They had the government of thoſe colleges many years, before they were a provincial body: and that gave them the ſame opportunities of drawing ſuch to be of their order.

They had the ſame opportunities, but not the ſame motives, to exert their power, and ſhew their zeal for the cauſe. After they became a provincial body, they had a family of their own to provide for.

Page 110.

It is ſtrange you could call their education heterogeneous: for the ſame effects are not from heterogeneous cauſes.

The effects might be the ſame, as to the qualifications of zealous miſſioners, let their education be at *Rheims*, or *Rome*; but not as to other conſiderations, which ought not to be neglected. Excellent fighting-cocks are hatch'd under a *Crow*, as well as under a *Hen* of their own kind. But a *Crow* will be but a ſorry mother, to take care of the young *Chickens*. She ſometimes

times join's with the *Kite*, to deſtroy what ſhe has hatch'd. They muſt be put under the care of a better guardian, for their improvement and preſervation.

Page 110.

Dr. Allen *did not attribute any of the blame to the* Jeſuits, *nor diſapprove of their having that government.*

Dr. *Allen* was at a great diſtance, and cou'd not diſcover the maſter-ſpring, that gave motion to the contrivance; which Dr. *Lewis*, who was upon the ſpot, and knew the whole affair, gave him a hint of in his letter. However, as Dr. *Allen* had a great opinion of the *Jeſuits* abilities for educating youth; ſo he was well pleaſed, that the lot fell upon them to govern the college; eſpecially, underſtanding that the *Pope* had order'd matters ſo. This was the reaſon, that he would not hearken to another alteration propoſed by ſome of the Clergy; alledging, that it argued levity and inconſtancy, to be ſo often upon changing. At the ſame time, tho' Dr. *Allen* was ſo well content to have the college govern'd by the *Jeſuits*, he could not foreſee, nor wou'd have approv'd of the conduct of thoſe, who managed it to the detriment of the Clergy.

Page 111.

Proved very prejudicial to the whole body of the Clergy.

If it is prejudicial to the whole body of

Jeſuits,

Jeſuits, to charge a few of their members with miſbehaviour, and unfair dealing, (to talk in your key) why is it not prejudicial to the whole body of the Clergy, to charge a great number of their moſt eminent men with ſcandalous behaviour? by the whole body of the Clergy I don't mean every individual perſon. I know it was not prejudicial to thoſe, you think were on the right ſide of the queſtion.

Page 111.

John Bridgwater.

I make a doubt of his being a *Jeſuit*, becauſe neither *Pitts*, nor *Alegambe* ſay any thing of his being one of that order. This doubt you confirm by producing nothing for the affirmative, but that *Alegambe* might ſuppoſe it. Had there been as many circumſtances to ſhew, that Dr. *Bridgwater* was a *Jeſuit*, as that *Strada* was one (who, you ſay, is not called a *Jeſuit* by *Alegambe*) your remark had been more to the purpoſe.

Page 112.

Chriſtopher Bagſhaw.

This is one of thoſe Clergymen, whoſe name you think ought to be buried in oblivion. But why? was it, becauſe he was one of the appellants? no: The appellants, indeed, for a while, ſuffer'd in their reputation, till the Pope was better inform'd. Afterwards, they were thought fit to be aſſiſtants to the Arch-prieſts, became preſidents of colleges, deans, and biſhops; and

even

even Dr. *Bagſhaw*, the man you ſo much deſpiſe, was judged by the *Benedictin Monks* worthy of a mitre. This is the man, you were ſo willing to paſs over in ſilence. It ſeems then, that omiſſions, you ſo much complain of in regard of the *Jeſuits*, are no fault, when the merits of a clergyman are to be mentioned; or if you mention them, 'tis with a mark of ignominy.

Page 114.

Soon after you call theſe things encroachments.

Were they not viſible encroachments upon the liberties of the clergy, to be obliged to part with their ancient profeſſors, frequent the *Jeſuits* ſchools, turn out their own confeſſor, and entertain a *Jeſuit* in his place?

Page 115.

Nay the cardinal [Allen] *ſays expreſsly, the committing the houſe to the Society was all our deſires.*

Your accounts are often falſe, for want of diſtinguiſhing times. The ſeniors of *Rheims college* were not deſirous, that their brethren ſhou'd be diſpoſſeſſed of the *Roman* college; but after they underſtood, his Holyneſs had order'd, it ſhould be ſo; they were glad, the care of the houſe was committed to the *Jeſuits*, having a good opinion of them *at that time.*

Page 116.

Mark Buckworth *and* John Buſthard.

The

The firſt was undoubtedly brought up a clergyman. If afterwards he became a Monk, 'tis more than I find in my memoirs: nor do you produce any thing, to prove he was a monk. As for Mr. *Buſthard*, tho' he was firſt a clergyman, yet I own in my account of him, that he became a *Jeſuit*. Why I ſay, I find no account of him in your writers, (which you contradict by naming F. *More*) might be from F. *More*'s miſtaking his name, and ſome circumſtances, not applicable to the perſon I ſpeak of.

Page 116.

John Cornelius. *It is very ſtrange, that you take no notice of his entering into the Society. He profeſſed himſelf a* Jeſuit *juſt before his death. ——you could not be ignorant of his dying a* Jeſuit.

The account I give of him, is from an ancient manuſcript. It contain's ſeveral particulars, you ſeem a ſtranger to. It inform's me, that he was a clergyman, and went under that character upon the miſſion, without the leaſt intimation of his being a *Jeſuit*. If he was ever admitted into the Society, it muſt be clandeſtinely, while he was a priſoner, and a little before his death, without noviceſhip, or any other ceremonies required at a profeſſion: and by this means it might be a ſecret to the writer of my memoirs. Had I been favour'd with your records, I would have done you juſtice, as to this particular; tho' I might for brevity ſake, and out of prudence, have omitted

ſeveral

veral other particulars; eſpecially the apparition, he had from lord *Stourton*, who being in purgatory deſired his prayers. This, perhaps I ſhould have omitted out of prudence, unleſs the ſtory had been better atteſted, than ſome of your relations are.

Page 119.

Dr. Stapleton — *Cardinal* Allen— *could not perſwade him* [Stapleton] *to forſake the noviceſhip out of any diſlike to the order.*

You omit no opportunity to ſignify the great reſpect, and affection cardinal *Allen*, Dr. *Stapleton* and other clergymen of thoſe times, had for your order: which is a needleſs obſervation with regard to your preſent purpoſe, unleſs you will bring them in to patronize all the abuſes charged upon ſeveral members of the order. Not only thoſe eminent clergymen, but all of that body, ever ſince, have had a reſpect for the order. Nor is it juſtice to imagine, that the cardinal perſuaded Dr. *Stapleton* to forſake the noviceſhip out of any diſlike to the order, as you wou'd have me ſay. He was a perſon of better principles (and the ſame I will venture to ſay of myſelf) than to diſlike any order, that is approved of by God's church. And yet, at the ſame time, a man may not think it convenient, to become a member of every order, he like's. As to the caſe of Dr. *Stapleton*; I find two reaſons alledged for his forſaking the noviceſhip. One attributed to *Cardinal Allen*, who thought it was more for the good of re-

ligion to follow the employment he was in before, than to be ſhut up in a convent. The other I made mention of in *Dr. Stapleton's life*, as it is recorded in the diary of *Doway* college: *viz.* that it was for the ſake of his health. Whether one, or both, or ſome other, was the real motive, I will not determin.

Page 121.

There will ariſe a moſt holy, new religious order, that will be free and ſpiritual; which the Popes of Rome, *enjoying peace of the church, ſhall rely upon. Which religion and order God will love above all others, becauſe it's perfection ſhall ſurpaſs that of all other orders.*

A prophecy of one abbot *Joachim*, quoted by Dr. *Stapleton* from Lib. 5 Concordiæ fol. 14. and applied by him to the *Jeſuits*; and alledged by you, to ſhew the great opinion Dr. *Stapleton* had of your ſociety. And ſo much indeed it prove's. But were I diſpoſed to criticiſe upon the point, there appear's to me to be neither prudence in quoting this revelation, nor juſtice in the application. Who was this abbot *Joachim?* I meet with none of that name, of any account, but abbot *Joachim*, who lived about the time mention'd by *Stapleton*, *anno* 1200, and was condemned for erroneous doctrine by the fourth *Lateran* council under Pope *Innocent* III. *an.* 1215. If his doctrine was falſe, what credit can we give to his pretended Prophecies? Again, why ſhou'd this prophecy be particularly appl-ed to the *Jeſuits?* Are not all other orders ſpiritual?

ritual? Doe's the Pope rely only upon them? May not other orders contend with them, as to the rules of perfection? Is it not a ridiculous preſumption to affirm, that God love's the *Jeſuits* above any other order? or indeed to make compariſons between orders, on that account. I will not ſay, what your opinion may be, as to the truth and application of this prophecy. But as you wiſh it were true, and juſtly applyed to your ſociety; ſo I believe many of your credulous admirers do not in the leaſt doubt of either.

Page 121.

Implies almoſt a total debt.

If *Bellarmin* only borrowed from *Stapleton* what regard's the church, tradition, and ſcripture; it doe's not make the debt total, tho' too much for a *Jeſuit* to be indebted to a clergyman. *Bellarmin* is indebted to many others, beſide *Stapleton*; eſpecially to cardinal *Du Perron*, who took pains to perfect the anſwers commonly left unfiniſhed by *Bellarmin*; whoſe controverſial writings make a good common place book, and he himſelf may be regarded as an excellent methodical *Compiler*. This is the deſcription ſeveral great criticks give of his works.

Page 122.

This I have ſhew'd fully in the remarks upon Le Courayer.

Your remarks upon *Le Courayer* are of little value with ſome of your own brethren, as they have own'd to me; and by all other good jud-

ges are look'd upon as the worſt performance, that has appeared of the kind. If the Catholick divines of *Edward* VI, and queen *Mary's* days, were as explicit, as we cou'd have wiſhed they had been, in aſſigning the reaſons, why they rejected Proteſtant ordinations, 'tis more than can be collected from their writings, or your remarks.

Page 122.

Roger Filcock. *You take no notice of his being a* Jeſuit.

I don't mention to what body he belong'd; but had reaſon to place him among the clergy. You own, he was a clergyman, and had labour'd above two years on the miſſion, before he was admitted into your ſociety; which being done privately, it might either be queſtioned, or not taken notice of by me, and many others.

Page 125.

Thomas Metham.——*would you have your readers doubt of his being a* Jeſuit?—More, Bartoli, Juvency *ſhew it plainly.*

I don't labour to lead my readers into any miſtakes, as ſome do; but wait for their opinion, upon a true repreſentation of matters. The account your triumvirate give, is; that Mr. *Metham* was admitted into your ſociety in 1579; and that he had been 12 years a *Jeſuit*, when he died in 1592. The account I give from the original diary of *Doway* college, is; that he was a clergyman, and ſent from *Doway* upon the miſſion by the preſident Dr. *Allen* in the year 1574. By comparing times, it appear's, that he

he had been about five years a clergy miſſioner, before he was admitted into the ſociety. Nothing appear's in my account, that I doubted of his becoming a *Jeſuit*; but much to the contrary. I find (by his own letters) that he was deſirous of being admitted into your order. I expreſsly ſay, that ſome writers affirm, that he was actually admitted, before he died. Which is not contradicting, but confirming what your triumvirate relate. However I took the liberty to inſert him among the eminent men of the clergy upon ſeveral accounts. He was educated, ordain'd prieſt, honour'd with academical degrees, and became maſter of great accompliſhments under the direction of the *Clergy*. I cannot here omit, to take notice of the benefit, you receive by thoſe clandeſtin admiſſions of clergymen into your ſociety, without noviceſhip, or other ceremonies and preparatives, uſual in profeſſions. Beſides the reputation in having ſeveral eminent men put into the liſt of your members, there are ſeveral other conſiderations. I will take the liberty to mention an inſtance of this kind, which happened in our memory. Mr. *B—t*, a clergyman, was condemned to dye. During his impriſonment he was ſo plentifully relieved by the charity of good Catholicks, as to have a handſome ſum of money to diſpoſe of. But, before he died, being deſirous to become a *Jeſuit*, he was accordingly admitted. By this means there was a double advantage. The *Jeſuits* became maſters of his ſubſtance, and he of their ſuffrages.

Page 128.

Francis Page —*At his execution he not only made a profeſſion of his faith, but alſo gave particular thanks to God, that he was a novice of the Society of Jeſus.*

The noviceſhip did not make him a profeſſed *Jeſuit*. He was ſtill one of the body of the clergy; and has a better title to be put upon their liſt, than the *Noviceſhip* cou'd give him to be called a *Jeſuit*.

Page 130.

Alexander Briant.—*It occurred to him, that now was a proper time to confirm his purpoſe with a ſolemn vow.*

His caſe was this: He was educated a clergyman, made prieſt at *Doway*, and from thence ſent upon the miſſion: where having labour'd for ſome time, he was deſirous of being a *Jeſuit*; took a reſolution for that purpoſe; and during his impriſonment made a private vow to execute the deſign, which his death prevented. Will deſires, reſolutions, and private vows make perſons members of your ſociety? This is a ready way to fill your Catalogue with eminent men: but is it not a kind of robbery?

Page 132.

Thomas Cottam. Bartoli *would have inform'd you better.*

Alegambe ſay's, he was admitted into your ſociety, while he was a priſoner; but *Bartoli* ſay's,

ſay's, it was at *Rome* in the year 1579. Am I to reconcile your contradictory accounts, or entirely to reject both their teſtimonies? The diary of *Doway* college tell's us, he was made prieſt at *Rheims* among the clergy, and from thence ſent upon the miſſion. The manuſcript of his life and death, has nothing of his being a *Jeſuit*. What his deſires or reſolutions were, I cannot ſay: or whether privately admitted, as the cuſtom then was amongſt you.

Page 136.

Raynaudi *will diſabuſe you.*

Raynaudi, indeed, ſhew's, that other *divines* beſides thoſe of the ſociety, traded in the commodity of equivocation; but *ingroſſers* are dangerous to the publick.

Page 137.

Edmund Campian. *You complain that F.* More *omit's many particulars, wherein the honor of the Clergy may ſeem to be concerned.*

Was it not a juſt complaint of an omiſſion, when F. *More* ſay's, he only paſſed by *Doway* in his way to *Rome*? Whereas 'tis manifeſt, he remain'd at *Doway* two years; took academical degrees in divinity in that univerſity; and was profeſſor in the clergy's college. You endeavour to excuſe F. *More* by ſaying, he did it without any deſign. I wiſh you had ſhewn the ſame good diſpoſitions as to the omiſſions, you charge me with. Neither has *Bartoli* done juſtice in mentioning thoſe particulars omitted by

by F. *More:* Or if he had, will this excuſe F. *More*, or entitle him to the character of a fair and impartial Hiſtorian? And yet he is one of the *Triumvirate*, you rely upon.

Page 139.

But ſtill the tortures of his [Campian's] *conſcience, particularly for having received the pretended order of deacon in the new church of* England, *never ceaſed, till he entered into the Society of Jeſus.*

Either you don't give yourſelf time to think, or you have a very odd way of thinking. Did Mr. *Campian*, after his converſion, remain two years at *Doway* under the tortures of his conſcience? Had he not repented for the offence you mention? Were the clergy of the college in *Doway* ſo ignorant, or remiſs, as not to put him in mind of that part of his duty? Can any thing, but a conceited value, you have for yourſelves, make you aſcribe that thing to his being a *Jeſuit*, which belong'd to him while he was a clergyman? He cou'd have no tortures of conſcience, after he had repented, excepting a ſorrow for having offended God. This ſorrow he had all the time he was at *Doway*, and it never ceaſed, after he became a *Jeſuit*.

Page 140.

William Weſton.

You give a large account of his excellent qualifications; and impute it to me, as a fault, that I have not done the ſame. Such omiſſions

I have

I have often accounted for. As for his being a promoter of the diſturbances, that happened in *Wisbich caſtle*, I don't accuſe him. Cou'd I expreſs myſelf more modeſtly, than to ſay, *ſome lay'd that to his charge?* How far a good man may be the occaſion of diſturbances, by laying ſchemes, that tend that way, I have fully explain'd in my general reply.

Page 146.

Robert Southwell.

You mention nothing to be amended in the character of this worthy perſon. All you complain of, is omiſſions. I have deſcribed him to have been a man of extraordinary qualifications, and a glorious martyr. As for his being ſtolen out of his cradle by a gypſy, and the repeated account you give of his great affection for your ſociety, there was no preſſing occaſion of taking notice of ſuch particulars.

Page 150.

Henry Walpole.

Tho' I have given a character of this gentleman, and ſome paſſages of his life ſufficiently declare his worth: yet according to your ingenious remarks, I am unfortunate in not having ſaid enough; and eſpecially in ſaying, he was put *ſeveral times* upon the rack, whereas I ſhould have ſaid *fourteen times.*

Page 152.

Thomas Pound--*I will not ask, why you took no notice of his being a* Jeſuit, *tho' he was one for many years.*

I find

I find him often mention'd as a worthy *Lay Gentleman*, who aſſiſted the miſſioners upon all occaſions. But my memoirs never ſignify poſitively, that he was a *Jeſuit*. You ſay he was admitted in 1578: but where, or in what manner, you do not declare. It was not abroad: but in *England*. It might be by deſire, *in voto*, or by a clandeſtine admiſſion: or perhaps he was one of your *Lay-oblati*. Theſe may ſeem ſufficient motives to you, to lay claim to him.

Page 157.

George Gilbert. *Here again, Sir, I will not aſk you, why you take no notice of this holy man being of the ſociety.*

I never thought it a fair way of dealing, to have thoſe put into the liſt of your deſerving men, who were admitted into the ſociety only upon their death-bed. Mr. *Gilbert* was a perſon of great ſubſtance, and remarkable for his zeal in ſupporting the firſt miſſioners of your order, that were ſent into *England*. As he always loved you during his life; ſo queſtionleſs he did not forget you, when he was admitted into your order at his death.

Page 162.

William Hart.

'Tis a ſenſible grief, that you cannot lay claim to this learned, and heroick martyr. However, you comfort your ſelves with the thoughts, that he was deſirous of being admitted into your order; and nothing, but death, prevented it.

Page 163.

Thomas Morgan——*As to ſeem not only to take his part againſt the* Jeſuits, *but even charge them with a deteſtable crime againſt him, or at leaſt to leave it a doubtful caſe.*

Mr. *Morgan* was a ſervant to *Mary* queen of *Scots*; and reſiding in *Paris* was accuſed of betraying his truſt, and holding a correſpondence with the Miniſtry in *England:* and, upon that information, was impriſon'd; till, his caſe being well examin'd, he was releas'd. Theſe accuſations were again reviv'd, when he was in *Bruſſels.* Here he was aſſaſſinated by one *Gage*, who was ſeized and impriſoned. It being well known to every body, that the *Jeſuits* were no friends to Mr. *Morgan* upon ſeveral accounts, and that they laboured to obtain Mr. *Gage's* freedom; this occaſion'd many perſons to cenſure the *Jeſuits.* What you alledge againſt me in relation to this matter, is: that I ſeem to take part with Mr. *Morgan*, againſt the *Jeſuits*, if not to charge them with the aſſaſſination; at leaſt to leave it doubtful. Thus far I will preſume to defend Mr. *Morgan*; that he was not guilty of the accuſations lay'd againſt him; being declared innocent by the *Queen of Scots* herſelf; as appear's by her letters in his favour. As to charging the *Jeſuits* with the aſſaſſination, I plainly inſinuate, it was an uncharitable reflexion. And as for leaving it doubtful, 'tis your own interpretation; unleſs you expect, as you ſeem to do,

do, that I ſhou'd make an apology for every one that is aſperſed with calumnies; which is an endleſs taſk.

Page 165.

Thus you carry thoſe very records, which are the juſtification of the Jeſuits, *and the confutation of your hiſtory.*

This is one of thoſe bold ſtrokes, and *Gaſconiades*, wherewith your ſpecimen abound's: which if true, you might have ſpared yourſelf the pains of making ſo many idle remarks. This alone would have carried the cauſe. But to your confuſion (if you are capable of bluſhing) you cannot produce one inſtance, that my *Records* confute my hiſtory, or juſtify your brethren, that are impeach'd.

Page 166.

That great and moſt holy man Mr. Sherwin *is the firſt of thoſe, who went to offer a ſupplication to the Pope in the affair of putting the* Engliſh *college at* Rome *under the care of the ſociety.*

That great and holy man Dr. *Biſhop*, afterwards biſhop of *Chalcedon*, was one of the firſt that offer'd a ſupplication to the Pope concerning the *Arch-prieſt*, and was back'd afterwards by a body of Clergymen (ſome whereof were glorious martyrs) not to have the Arch-prieſt depoſed (as the diſobedient ſcholars petition'd to have Dr. *Clenock* depoſed) but only to have his power explain'd and confirm'd. If you are ſo well diſpoſed, as to find out excuſes for the diſ-

obedi tn

obedient *Scholars*, 'tis a wonder, you ſhould condemn the appealing Clergy, who were guilty of no diſobedience.

Page 166.

A plain proof that he [*Dr.* Lewis] *did not think them blameable, or authors of diſturbances.*

Your plain proofs generally have the misfortune not to have the reputation of conjectures. Doe's the two *Jeſuits* being employed as prefect and procurator in the college, render it incredible, that they ſhould be authors of diſturbances? All others would think, it gave them a fair opportunity by having an influence over the ſcholars. 'Tis certain Dr. *Clenock*, the preſident, charged them with breeding diſturbances: And Dr. *Lewis* gave a hint that way in his letter to Dr. *Allen:* To ſay nothing, how induſtrious the *Jeſuits* were in eſpouſing the intereſt of the rebellious ſcholars.

Page 167.

For the ſake of Muſh, Giffard, *and ſome others, you might have uſed a ſofter term, than that of malcontents.*

The term is too ſoft for thoſe, that diſobey'd both the *Pope* and Cardinal, in not ſubmitting to Dr. *Clenock*, their lawful ſuperior. Nor have I any inducement to favour *Muſh*, *Giffard*, or any others, that were concern'd in that rebellion. They were afterwards of another opinion,

nion, when they diſcover'd what uſe the *Jeſuits* made of their power.

Page 168.

That, tho' the diſorders were exceedingly diſliked, yet the committing the houſe to the ſociety, was all our deſires.

Thus, you ſay, Dr. *Allen* and the *Seniors* of *Rheims* college expreſſed themſelves upon the revolution, that happened in the *Roman College*; which amount's to no more than this: that ſince his Holyneſs was reſolved to take the college out of the hands of the Clergy, and had actually committed it to the care of the *Jeſuits*; they were well pleaſed with it; not only out of ſubmiſſion to the Pope's orders, but becauſe they had a great opinion of the *Jeſuits* for the education of youth. But at the ſame time, they don't approve of the methods, that were made uſe of to bring about this alteration; nor of the diſobedient behaviour of thoſe, who labour'd for it.

Page 171.

I ſay; if it is genuine: for, tho' you ſay, the original is in Doway *College; yet it has no date: and, by your own account both in your chronological table and in your lives, Dr.* Lewis *died before Cardinal* Allen, *tho' this ſupplication ſuppoſe's the contrary.*

Tho' you have given many inſtances of the bad opinion, you have of me; yet you cannot think me ſo void of common honeſty, as to have forged this record. As to the pretended incon-

inconſiſtency between my account of the time of *Cardinal Allen*'s death, and that of *Biſhop Lewis*'s, and what is inſinuated (only in a parentheſis) in the ſupplication, it doe's not deſtroy the credit of the record; but, at the moſt, that there was only a miſtake of a few days in my account. The reſt of your remarks are idle and frivolous. Mean time, a ſupplication of above forty members of the College, ſigned with their own hands, againſt your adminiſtration, is a plain proof, you did not manage matters to the benefit of the Clergy.

Page 171.

For it make's him ſay, that from the time of the diſturbance, the Jeſuits *took no care at all of the diſcipline, and manners of the ſcholars.*

I don't pretend, Dr. *Clenock*'s account to be an original: but, as it is conformable to what may be met with in other relations, it was proper to take notice of it, and give it a place among other Records. The exception you make againſt it, is a manifeſt miſrepreſentation. For he doe's not accuſe the two *Jeſuits* of neglecting the diſcipline of the houſe in the main, as you pretend; but only for thoſe few days of the diſturbance, when they were permitted to cabal both within doors and without, to the neglecting of their ſtudies and diſcipline; which thoſe two *Jeſuits* ought to have prevented: and therefore might be ſuſpected of favouring them, by not preventing them.

Page

Page 172.

The Cardinal expreſsly ſay's, he acted in it according to the will of the Pope. How then could you ſay, he did it by virtue of his protectorſhip?

The cardinal was made protector by the *Pope:* His protectorſhip empowered him, to regulate the *Engliſh* miſſion: The eſtabliſhing of an *Arch-prieſt* was the regulation; and the cardinal acting by commiſſion from the Pope, what he did was ſo far according to the Pope's will. Whether the Pope diſtinctly approved of every article of the cardinal's *letter*, or left the wording of it to his eminence, may be very much queſtioned, ſince his Holineſs thought proper to alter ſeveral things at the requeſt of the appealing clergy. And whether the Cardinal was not aſſiſted, and inſtigated by others, who might miſrepreſent matters, may alſo be very much queſtion'd; or rather 'tis unqueſtionable, conſidering who they were, that had an intereſt in ſome of the orders, and how vigorouſly they oppoſed the appealing clergy, who petition'd to have thoſe orders repealed.

Page 173.

Did you place this piece in your records, to let us ſee, that you and the protector were very different in your ſentiments?

I placed this, and other pieces regarding the arch-prieſt, as the moſt authentick teſtimonies, to inform the reader, how to judge of thoſe matters. 'Tis not material, whether I and the Cardinal were of the ſame, or of a different

ferent opinion: but that the Pope and Cardinal were not of the ſame opinion, is manifeſt by the Pope's taking from the Arch-prieſt that unreaſonable power, the Cardinal had given him.

Page 174.

You call it the proteſtation of Mr. Muſh, *one of the chief of the Appellants; you date it* March *the 8th*, 1599. *The appeal is dated* November 17, 1600. *As yet therefore,* Muſh *was no Appellant, but only a Proteſter.*

You hunt after amendments upon a very cold ſcent by ſuch trifling remarks. Where is the inconſiſtency in calling Mr. *Muſh* both a *Proteſter* and an *Appellant?* He may juſtly be called an Appellant, tho' his particular proteſtation bear's date before the appeal. Beſides, the Clergy appeal'd more than once, tho' not in ſo general a manner. 'Tis true, the appeal, recited among the records, bear's date *Anno* 1600; but it was agreed to, and drawn up long before. So that Mr. *Muſh*, as being one of the chief upon ſeveral accounts, may be called an Appellant.

Page 174.

And what doth he [*Mr.* Muſh] *proteſt againſt? The Arch prieſt's Authority.*

This is a notorious falſhood. He only deſire's, to have his power confirm'd and explain'd: and in the mean time he promiſe's obedience to him. *Interea autem dum hæc ſciantur, Archipreſbytero, quem narrant nobis ſuperiorem jam eſſe conſtitutum, in nulla re contradicam;*

tradicam; aut ejus authoritati (qualis qualis fuerit) refragabor: ut Chriſtiana pax, & charitas integra inter nos & illæſa in omnibus permaneant. And, in the mean time, till theſe things are known, I will not in any matter oppoſe the Arch-prieſt, who, they tell us, is made our ſuperior; nor will I go againſt his authority, whatever it is: that chriſtian peace and charity may be preſerv'd entire and inviolable among us, in all things. Theſe are the words of Mr. *Muſh* in his proteſt.

Page 175.

The ſcandals, Muſh *ſpeak's of, did not proceed from the authority, but from the diſobedience of the oppoſers.*

I don't find, that *Muſh*, or any other of the Appellants, objected any thing againſt the authority, but againſt abuſes. Complaints of this kind are the uſual ſubject of appeals; when thoſe, that act by commiſſion, miſbehave themſelves. This was the origin of thoſe ſcandals, Mr. *Muſh* complain's of, as the Pope himſelf own'd, when he taxed the Arch-prieſt with exceeding his power; and, by ſeveral new regulations, removed the true occaſion of the ſcandal.

Page 175.

Who would not expect, thoſe Cardinals ſhould ſay ſomething to clear them, if they had been injured?

The caſe was this: Mr. *Biſhop*, and Mr. *Charnock*, two eminent miſſioners, were ſent by the Clergy,

Clergy, as Agents, to *Rome*, to complain of the Arch-prieſt's adminiſtration. No ſooner were they arrived there, but they were ſeized and put under confinement, upon the account of the ſcandalous character given of them from *England*, and other places. Cardinal *Cajetan*, and Cardinal *Borgheſe* were commiſſion'd to examin them: and upon the reſult, they were order'd not to return into any of the *Engliſh* dominions, without leave, and till ſuch time, as their behaviour gave content. Now, let any impartial man judge, what circumſtances theſe two clergymen were in, to wipe off the aſperſion. They had no friends in *Rome*: *England* was at a great diſtance: and, as for their Brethren there, many of them were involved in the ſame cauſe. Had they appeared in *Rome*, they ran the hazard of being treated after the ſame manner with their two Agents. Had time permitted them to ſend letters, what credit wou'd have been given to 'em, conſidering the great power of thoſe, that had given them a bad character? or what pretence cou'd the two Cardinals have, to declare them innocent, when they had no grounds to go upon, but an infamous character, which was credited; and, at that time, cou'd not be diſprov'd? tho', afterwards, it appear'd to be an aſperſion.

Page 176.

And pray tell us, how, in the title of this piece, you ſtile thoſe two, Appellants [*vid.* Biſhop *and* Charnock.] *It is dated* April 21, 1599. *The*

appeal is dated the following year, November 17. *Nor are their names amongſt the Appellants.*

A great many of the ſubſcribers to the appeal [about 42 in number] ſeem to have been priſoners in *Wiſbich Caſtle*; tho' ſeveral others joyned with them, and ſome hundreds of the laity. Among the Clergy I might very reaſonably mention Mr. *Biſhop* and Mr. *Charnock*; who not being then priſoners in *Wisbich*, but perhaps priſoners at *Rome*, had not the opportunity of ſubſcribing; but juſtly may be called *Appellants*, ſince they had, before, made an appeal to the ſame purpoſe.

Page 176.

That he [*the Pope*] *did not think in the leaſt, that any deference was to be had to their appeal, and that they ought to have obey'd.*

By your treacherous way of telling your ſtory, you wou'd make the reader believe, that the Clergy never made but one appeal: and that the Pope rejecting that appeal, you have done the Appellants buſineſs at one ſtroke, and at the ſame time confuted my hiſtory by making it contradict my own records: whereas you ought to have conſidered, that they made ſeveral appeals, and upon different ſubjects. The firſt appeal was made by ſeveral old miſſioners, eſpecially from the North, who ſent Mr. *Biſhop*, and Mr. *Charnock* to *Rome*, to offer their reaſons, why they ſuſpected, the Cardinal's letter, conſtituting an *Arch-prieſt*, was not authentick: and if that difficulty was removed, to have his Holyneſs's con-

confirmation. Accordingly, the difficulty being removed, and the Arch-prieſt's power confirm'd by an expreſs brief of his Holyneſs, thoſe appellants acquieſced, and there was an end of that part of the controverſy. This appeal, indeed, was diſregarded by the Pope, as well it might; he having aſſured the Appellants, that the Cardinal's letter was a deed according to his own will: So that having a regard to the appeal, was rendering his own orders inſignificant, and favouring an appeal againſt his own authority; which thoſe Appellants never intended. They only appeal'd for an enquiry; and in the mean time, did not diſobey the power placed over them. Beſides this appeal, ſeveral others follow'd after: eſpecially that almoſt general appeal, preſented in the year 1600, wherein the Clergy complained of the mal-adminiſtration of the Arch-prieſt.

Theſe appeals were ſo far from being diſregarded by the *Pope*, that he enter'd into a ſerious conſideration about the contents; and, in two letters, or *Briefs* directed to the Arch-prieſt, expreſſed what he found amiſs in his conduct, and preſcribed rules how to preſerve peace between him and the appellants for the future. Among other complaints of the appellants, he find's, that he had exceeded his commiſſion in ſeveral things: that he had encouraged books ſet forth in order to prove them *Schiſmaticks*; refuſed to recall 'em, or to do the appellants juſtice, as to that ſcandalous accuſation: That he had ſuſpended ſome of them, and deprived

them of their faculties, contrary to what the canons of the church require in ſuch caſes: that he excluded them from having any hand in the affairs of the Clergy: that he obſtructed their appeals to the ſee of *Rome:* That he was partial in diſtributing the charities collected for thoſe in priſon, the appellants being neglected: that he conſulted the *Jeſuits* ſo much in the governing of the Clergy, that it occaſioned great jealouſies and diſturbance. Theſe and ſuch like are the complaints of the appellants, hinted at or expreſſed in the Pope's briefs to the Arch-prieſts; which he ſo much attended to, that he made the following ordinances. In the firſt place, he declare's, that the Arch-prieſt had exceeded his commiſſion: *neque facultates tuas excedas, ut viſus fuiſti in quibuſdam caſibus exceſſiſſe.* And particularly, as to their being deprived of their faculties, he ſaith: *nunquam amiſerunt; prout nec eos illas amiſiſſe per has litteras declaramus.* To remedy his miſbehaviour, in not conſulting thoſe eminent Clergymen, who were appellants; he ordain's, that they ſhall be employed for the future: *Simulatque verò contigerit, aliquos ex modernis aſſiſtentibus deficere, ſimiliter tibi mandamus, ut tres ex Preſbyteris appellantibus, in eorum locum ſucceſſivè, ut eos deficere contigerit, ſubſtituas.* Then as for the capital complaint, that the Arch-prieſt managed the concerns of the Clergy by the Advice of the *Jeſuits*; he give's the following orders: *Authoritate Apoſtolicâ tenore præſentium, tibi in virtute ſanctæ obedientiæ mandamus,*

damus, ut nulla negotia, ad officium tuum ſpectantia expedias, communices, aut tractes cum provinciali ſocietatis Jeſu, vel aliis religioſis ejuſdem ſocietatis in Anglia exiſtentis; ne ſcilicet novæ diſcordiæ et contentionis inter eos & Presbyteros appellantes occaſio præbeatur: ac propterea inſtructionem tibi à dicto Henrico Cardinali Cajetano ſuper hac re traditam, pari authoritate per præſentes tollimus, & abrogamus. Inſuper tibi præcipimus, ne de eccleſiæ Anglicanæ adminiſtratione, & regimine, vel de rebus ad dictum regimen, & officium tuum pertinentibus, per litteras, vel inſtructam perſonam, vel alio quovis modo cum religioſis ejuſdem ſocietatis, in Romana curia, vel alibi ubicunque commorantibus, agas. I have only two things to remark upon occaſion of theſe briefs of Pope *Clement* VIII. The one is; whether his Holyneſs can be ſaid to have diſregarded the Clegy's appeal, who comply'd with their deſires, and gave ſuch ſtrict commands in favour of their appeal. The other is; whether father *Parſons* and his adherents comply'd with his Holyneſs's commands, when (as I ſhall prove from their original letters) they ſtruggled and tamper'd with the Archprieſt for ſeveral years after, to follow their ſuggeſtions in the governing of the Clergy.

Page 177.

You muſt give me leave to tell you, there are many defects in your diſſertation [of ordination.]

You who have publiſh'd a whole treatiſe upon the ſubject; might have taken the liberty

to have pointed at ſome of thoſe defects. But you had ſo ill ſucceſs in that performance, that 'tis more for your credit not to mention particulars, leſt your remarks ſhou'd have the ſame fate.

Page 178.

What occaſion was there for the reaſons, why the council of Trent *is not received in* France, *in points of diſcipline?*

It was to put you, and ſuch as you, in mind of the behaviour of ſuch, as denied the neceſſity of *Epiſcopal Approbation* in confeſſors (tho' commanded by the council of *Trent*) upon a pretence, that the council of *Trent* was not received in *England* in points of diſcipline.

Page 179.

It was not at firſt a diſpute, but a diſobedience.

The firſt, that oppoſed the Arch-prieſt, ſubmitted to him conditionally *pendente lite*. They were declared to be neither guilty of diſobedience, nor of *Schiſm* by the univerſity of *Paris*. The Pope himſelf obliged the Arch-prieſt to condemn and recall all the books, that had aſperſed them with ſchiſm and diſobedience; and pronounced *ipſo facto* excommunication againſt any, for the future, that ſhould charge them with thoſe crimes. But you, it ſeem's, dare publickly, and in print contradict the Pope's decree. Is this your reſpect, this your obedience to the ſee of *Rome?*

Page 179.

I preſume you will not aſſert ſuch as Watſon *and* Clark *to be your eminent men.*

I have expreſsly by name ſet *Watſon* aſide, as being one that had defended a good cauſe with too much paſſion, and a breach of charity. The others, I depend upon, were generally perſons of great dignity, virtue, and learning. Do you joyn *Watſon* with them, out of the reſpect you have for eminent Clergymen? Is the whole college of Apoſtles to be ſneer'd at, becauſe one villain was a member amongſt them?

Page 179.

You ſpeak, as if Mr. Biſhop *and* Charnock *went to* Rome *in favour of the Appellants; I have ſhew'd you, that the appeal was a year after their journey to* Rome.

I have ſhew'd you already, that the Clergy made ſeveral appeals before the general one in 1600. One was, when the Agents mentioned were ſent to *Rome* by a number of Clergymen in the North. If you had obſerv'd this, it wou'd have ſet your reader right. But as you have miſrepreſented the matter, it only diſcover's the groundleſs pretences you have, to make me inconſiſtent in my accounts.

Page 179.

It was through F. Parſons's *interceſſion, that greater ſeverity was not uſed.*

This pretended interceſſion was a ſecret a mon-

mong yourſelves. The Clergy look'd upon F. *Parſons* to be concern'd in the two *Agents* impriſonment, and an abettor of the bad character the Arch-prieſt had ſent after them from *England*. The zeal F. *Parſons* always ſhew'd in defending the Arch-prieſt againſt the Appellants, and particularly in attacking the two Agents, is a plain indication that he could not be an interceſſor in their favour.

Page 180.

I preſume, you would not ſay, the Pope deferred ſending Biſhops, and ſo long, upon matters not worthy of conſideration.

The Pope had ſeveral motives for not eſtabliſhing epiſcopal government in *England*; ſome whereof might be ſuggeſted upon domeſtick views by thoſe, that imagin'd a better hand might be made of an Arch-prieſt, than of a Biſhop. But whatever his Holyneſs's motives were before, he did not think them ſufficient to defer the matter any longer: and tho' formerly his motives were worthy of conſideration, at this juncture they were not judged to be ſo.

Page 180.

It was when the age of ſeventy years, and other methods of conduct, had alter'd the opinion formerly had of this Gentleman.

This is all a ſurmiſe. It doe's not appear, that the court of *Rome* ever alter'd their opinion, as to the real merits of Dr. *Biſhop*; nor that the Doctor ever alter'd the opinion, he had

of

of the proceedings of the Clergy; whoſe cauſe he ſtrenouſly aſſerted, when he was their Agent at *Rome*, and ſo continued till he was made Biſhop. No oppoſition was made againſt his promotion for having been an *Appellant*. The contrivance was detected; and the whole ſtory become a jeſt.

Page 181.

Were neither engaged in, nor acquainted with the Gunpowder plot.

If this was the declaration of Sir *Everard Digby*, as you affirm; he only ſpeak's with regard to his own thoughts. That the *Jeſuits* were not engaged in that plot, will be eaſily granted with regard to *all of them*; but that *ſome* of them, one way or other, were not acquainted with it, is contrary to all accounts; even your own.

Page 181.

Sure, you think, they were in other reſpects ſufficiently independent of the Jeſuits, *from the time of* Clement *the Eighth's Bull, in* 1602.

The Bull of Pope *Clement* VIII. was a good ſtep towards making the Clergy independent of the *Jeſuits:* but it was far from effecting it. The *Jeſuits* neither obſerv'd the Bull, nor deſiſted from ſuch methods, as manifeſtly betray'd their deſign of having the clergy ſtill depending upon them. They endeavour'd to explain away the force of the decree, as if there were ſtill room to give the Arch-prieſt advice, how to govern the clergy. F. *Parſons*, in particular, gave ſeveral inſtances of this kind for ſome years

years after the prohibition expreſs'd in the Bull. He inſtruct's the Arch-prieſt, what aſſiſtants were to be made choice of, and who were proper Agents to be ſent to *Rome*; he tell's him, that thoſe he had ſent, were unfit perſons; and therefore he took the liberty to oppoſe them in many things, they propoſed for the good of the clergy. He proceed's in the ſame manner, in regard of the college in *Doway*; where for a while he direct's the Preſident Dr. *worthington*, how to manage the houſe. But that Gentleman, at laſt, becoming refractory, a ſcheme is laid to remove him, and tempt him with a mitre; and there were two other clergymen, more plyable, propoſed to ſucceed him. In this manner the clergy were obliged to ſtruggle for independency, even after *Clement* VIII's Bull. Nor did they ever recover their freedom, till by degrees the *Jeſuit* confeſſor was diſcharged from *Doway* college, profeſſors of the clergy employ'd to teach the ſcholars, and a Preſident choſen, who went hand in hand with the Arch-prieſt and the reſt of his brethren, to compleat the work.

Page 182.

Thoſe orders were, what the Jeſuits *thought convenient for peace ſake; and that the Pope did not give them out of any ſuſpicion of the* Jeſuits; *but that he declared the contrary.*

When the Cardinal firſt gave inſtructions to the Arch-prieſt, that he ſhould take the advice of the *Jeſuits* in governing the clergy, the *Jeſuits*

ſuits thought the order convenient, and accordingly comply'd with it. When the Pope recalled this order, the *Jeſuits* alſo thought the revocation convenient; but yet they did not think it convenient, to comply with the order, but ſtill went on to give the Arch-prieſt directions upon the affairs of the clergy. As to any ſiniſter ſuſpicion, the Pope might have of the *Jeſuits* upon this occaſion, I believe he had a good opinion of them in the main. But is it likely, he wou'd have recall'd the order given by the Cardinal (and, in your language, *conſtructively by himſelf)* upon any unjuſt remonſtrance of the Appellants, unleſs he had found ſome of the *Jeſuits* meddling ſo far with the affairs of the clergy, as to occcaſion thoſe great diſturbances, which happened?

Page 185.

Of whom [Watſon] *I would not have ſpoken thus, but as it is requiſite to prevent the impreſſions, ſome might take from his writings, unleſs they were forewarned, how little he is to be heeded.*

'Tis an eaſy matter to feel out your meaning, and diſcover your motives, in ſo often taking notice of Mr. *Watſon*'s miſbehaviour. 'Tis an uſeful Topic, indirectly to caſt dirt upon the *Clergy*, by having their cauſe eſpouſed by a perſon of ſo bad a character. And 'tis well, if ſome of your ignorant and bigotted readers don't take evil impreſſions againſt the clergy in general, by ſuch a contrivance. As to my own

particular:

particular: Is it not ſufficient, that I have diſclaim'd his Authority, and condemn'd the method, he took, to defend the cauſe of the clergy by ſcurrilous language, and aſperſing either your order, or any private member with calumnies? Did he not do you all the juſtice he cou'd, at the hour of his death, by acknowledging his fault and aſking your pardon? Wou'd it be a commendable or charitable proceeding in you, to vilify the memory of the thief, who repented upon the croſs, by rehearſing the irregularities, and crimes of his life paſt, and entertaining your reader with a legend of ſtories, pick'd up from groundleſs traditions? 'Tis not denied, that Mr. *Watſon*'s books were full of ſcurrilities, and uncharitable reflexions; and very probably might make evil impreſſions upon the minds of ignorant and ill-diſpoſed perſons. But as for thoſe miſchiefs you mention, give me leave to tell you, they are incredible, the ground of them being only from hearſay, and the report of unknown Authors; and, as they are recorded by *Bartoli*, they diſcover him to be an unjudicious and credulous writer.

Page 185.

George Blackwell, *you call him a creature of the* Jeſuits. *So* Watſon *had called him before.*

Had *Watſon* been guilty of no other fault, but calling the Arch-prieſt a *Creature* of the *Jeſuits*, there had been no occaſion for his repenting, and aſking forgiveneſs. But pray, Sir, what malignity is there in the word *Creature*? or how

how is it wrong apply'd? In a *Theological ſenſe*, every thing is a creature, that receive's a natural Being from God. In a *Political ſenſe*, thoſe are called creatures, who depend upon others, and in the execution of their Office, ſerve their ends. In all appearance, the *Jeſuits*, if they did not give the Arch-prieſt his *political Being*, they concurr'd ſo far in it, as to ſuggeſt the oeconomy, and nominate the perſon that was proper to be preferr'd. Beſides; every circumſtance of the affair plainly prove's, that he was a *political Creature* of the *Jeſuits*. Was he not order'd, by his inſtructions given him by the Cardinal, to conſult with the *Jeſuits* in the government of the clergy? Did not the *Jeſuits* continually ſupport him in all his pretenſions againſt the appealing clergy, as if the cauſe had been their own? Was not the Pope perſwaded of all this, when he order'd, that he ſhould apply himſelf no more to the *Jeſuits?*

Page 187.

They were againſt it [*the oath of Allegiance*] *from the very firſt.*

You cannot accuſe me of partiality, when I candidly own, that ſome of the clergy, as well as of the other regulars, took the oath. The *Jeſuits* indeed ſtood off; tho' a *quondam* great man of that order, as ſome ſay, was the firſt contriver of that enſnaring oath, in hopes it would divide the catholicks, and raiſe factions amongſt them; as it unfortunately did.

Page

Page 188.

The Direction, here ſpoken of, was the preſidentſhip of Dr. Worthington.

The direction, I ſpeak of, compriſe's all the time after Cardinal *Allen*'s death, when F. *Parſons*, being the chief, and in a manner the only man, conſulted about the *Engliſh* miſſion, did in conjunction with *Worthington*, and the Cardinal Protector, make alterations in the college at *Doway*, vid. that no one ſhould be admitted, but upon the recommendation of the Arch-prieſt, or ſuperior of the *Jeſuits*; and that a *Jeſuit* ſhould be confeſſor to the Students. Here you pretend I vary both from the truth, and from my ſelf. Your remarks are: vid. I aſcribe the alterations to Dr. *Worthington*'s time, which were made under his Predeceſſor Dr. *Barret*. The reader may eaſily do me juſtice in this point, by obſerving the date of Dr. *Barret*'s death, Dr. *Worthington*'s election, and the Cardinal's inſtructions for thoſe alterations. Dr. *Barret* died at *Doway* in *May* 1599. Dr. *Worthington* was choſen Preſident in *July* 1599. And the Cardinal's inſtructions, directed to him, bear date in *September* 1599. However, 'tis not unlikely, but the alterations might be concerted, and agreed to before Dr. *Barret*'s death; he being inclined to follow F. *Parſons*'s attempts, almoſt ever ſince Cardinal *Allen*'s death, as I have obſerv'd more than once. But let this be as you will, 'tis manifeſt, the alterations tended towards the prejudice of the clergy: nor can it be

be doubted, in whoſe favour, and by whoſe inſtigation, they were made. Again, you charge me with ſaying; the *ancient Doctors* left the college at *Rheims*; and that elſewhere I ſay, they left it under Dr. *Worthington*. This is eaſily reconcil'd from the Diary of *Doway* college; which inform's us, that they went off at different times. Some at *Rheims* under Dr. *Barret*, others at *Doway* alſo under Dr. *Barret*; and others at *Doway* under Dr. *Worthington*; their removal being according to the opportunities, they met with, of ſettling elſewhere. Another variation you charge me with, concerning thoſe *ancient Doctors*, is, that in one place I ſay, they were *diſcharged*, in another place I ſay, they *left* the college. Might I not truly and conſiſtently expreſs myſelf both ways? I might very well ſay, they *left* the houſe, if they were *diſcharged*. In regard of Dr. *Worthington*, you alledge, that I ſay, he was charged to carry on the project of the Arch-prieſt; whereas that project was eſtabliſh'd the year before he was made *Preſident*. And pray, was not an order to aſſiſt the Arch-prieſt, and to maintain his cauſe againſt the appealing Clergy, carrying on the project, tho' it was eſtabliſh'd before? Again: Am I not guilty of an inconſiſtence, in ſaying, the *Jeſuits* diſreliſh'd Dr. *Worthington*, and yet that he was a perſon entirely under the direction of F. *Parſons?* Here is an evident token, that you neither conſider'd my words, nor your own: You might plainly ſee, that I ſpoke of different times. Dr. *Worthington* was,

at firſt, willing to be directed by the *Jeſuits*; but afterwards, he refuſing to go all their lengths, they diſreliſh'd him. Now I leave the reader to judge, whether theſe, and ſuch childiſh exceptions, are worthy of conſideration? and much leſs to the purpoſe of the libeller, who with a front of braſs boldly affirm's, I contradict myſelf, and that my hiſtory is confuted by my own records. We have ſeen the times, when confident ſwearing has been ſo ſucceſsful, as to take away the lives of the innocent under an exaſperated and wicked court of judicature. But 'tis to be hoped *confident Aſſertions* will not have the ſame ſucceſs to the prejudice of truth; and that every *Reader* may have the liberty to believe his own eyes.

Page 192.

Juſt before, he [*Dr.* Clement] *was impartial; here he is playing the game of one party. Very fine words, but not very conſiſtent.*

Had you attended to ſuch inſtructions, as I gave the reader in my general reply, concerning partiality, it would have obviated the pretended difficulties you ſeem to labour under. You would have conſider'd, that tho' *Partiality* according to the common acceptation of the word, that is, as implying unfair and unjuſt dealing, was not allowable in a writer; yet if no more was meant by it, than maintaining the cauſe of a party by juſt reaſoning, it was not only allowable, but ſtrict duty. As for Dr. *Clement*, both the general character he had, and his being

employed

employed by the *Pope* and other ſuperior powers, as a proper perſon, to viſit *Doway College*, and give a true account of matters, was a ſufficient motive for me to ſtile him *impartial*. If, upon the viſitation, he found things had been carried on to the great prejudice of the Clergy, and that he was obliged to favour their juſt complaints, and take part with them, (which he cou'd not conveniently do, without ſome dexterity in playing their game, conſidering the power, and politicks of their adverſaries) yet he ſtill was impartial, as partiality, in the common acceptation of the word, import's injuſtice.

Page 192.

This character (and here you allow the truth of it) is ſo clear a confutation of moſt things, you have been often ſaying of the Jeſuits, *that every reader will be apt to ſay, was ever any writer ſo plainly ſelf-convicted?*

You certainly muſt preſume very much upon your Readers want of common underſtanding, by alledging what you mention here as an inſtance of ſelf-conviction. The Character Dr. *Clement* give's of the *Jeſuits*, in relation to *Doway* college, and which I approve of, is: that they were very ſerviceable as to the management of ſome temporal concerns of the college; particularly in taking care of the penſions payable from *Spain* and *Rome*: that they were excellently qualified for the education of youth: and moreover, that the *Jeſuit*, who was then confeſſor to the ſcholars, was a pious worthy perſon. Do I any where contradict this cha-

racter? Are any of theſe points mentioned by me, as ſubjects of complaints againſt the *Jeſuits?* I know, you don't love repetitions, eſpecially where the rehearſal muſt be ſo very ungrateful, at it would be to give a liſt of your encroachments upon the liberties of the Clergy: which I have ſo often mention'd, and ſo manifeſtly proved to be true, that it would be as needleſs in me, as irkſome to you, to repeat thoſe matters.

Page 193.

William Newman. *To take no farther notice of what you ſay of this Gentleman, and the college of* Liſbon.

You act the prudent part, in paſſing over in ſilence the affair of *Lisboe* college. You cannot ſtep a foot into it, without danger of ſticking faſt, and being ſmother'd in the mud. 'Tis ſo viſible a proof of your endeavours to diſtreſs the Clergy, that *Bartoli* with all his eloquence (you ſo much extoll him for) wou'd not be able to put any tolerable gloſs upon it. The only remark, you make upon that affair, is as follow's.

Page 193.

One muſt be very ſlow in believing, that a charitable founder would judge ſo uncharitably of thoſe, who had been ſo long remarkably zealous for the common cauſe.

One muſt be very incredulous, not to believe, that many, who have been remarkably zealous

lous for the common cauſe of religion, have not alſo been remarkably zealous for domeſtick intereſt, to the prejudice of the common cauſe. The pious founder of *Lisboe* college did not queſtion your zeal, for the common cauſe; but he had no good opinion of the methods, you took to interrupt his deſign, upon the ſelfiſh motive, becauſe the ſuperior of the college was not to be one of your order.

Page 194.

You told us, in Dr. Clement's *Life, the* Jeſuits *hoped for one more pliable in Dr.* Worthington's *place. This muſt naturally mean another Clergyman, and not a* Jeſuit. *Conſiſtency in hiſtory require's a better memory.*

As to what concern's Dr. *Worthington*'s giving up the college of *Doway* to the *Jeſuits*; the matter ſtand's thus, as it is plainly expreſs'd in the original letters of F. *Parſons*, Mr. *Fitzherbert*, and Mr. *Pilkinton*, to be found in my records: vid. that he offered to reſign the college to the *Jeſuits*; that perſons were employ'd by the *Jeſuits* to perſuade him to it; that he had the offer of a mitre; that F. *Parſons*, and the *Jeſuits* wou'd not accept of the college, but were deſirous it ſhou'd have a clergyman for Preſident, provided a quiet *peaceable man could be found*; that Dr. *Norton* and Dr. *Singleton* were mentioned, as the moſt proper perſons; that by the account, we have of their behaviour from their own and other authentick letters, they were violently in the *Intereſt* of

he *Jeſuits*. It doe's not appear from this account, or from my hiſtory, that a *Jeſuit* was to be ſuperior of the college. What Dr. *Worthington* deſign'd, I cannot tell: but that he intended, the *Jeſuits* ſhou'd have a power at leaſt of nominating a Preſident, with the Pope's approbation (which they cou'd not fail of obtaining, conſidering the great intereſt F. *Parſons* formerly, and the *Jeſuits* ſtill had in the court of *Rome*) is pretty plain. You ſee by this, that my memory has not fail'd me; nor is there any inconſiſtence in having the college deliver'd up to the *Jeſuits*, and their having a power to nominate the Preſident: tho' I preſume Dr. *Worthington* intended ſomething more for them, than a power of naming a Preſident; tho' your modeſty or policy refuſed it.

Page 195.

And yet be loath to allow, he died a novice of their order; while the thing is ſo very certain.

As Dr. *Worthington* was directed by the *Jeſuits* the greateſt part of his life, it is not a groundleſs conjecture, that he had an inclination to become one of that order; yet there are reaſons to think, he was not ſo much as a novice. For why did he defer it ſo long, having ſo fair an opportunity after he left *Doway*, and lived a conſiderable time in *Rome*? What ſort of noviceſhip cou'd he perform at Mr. *Biddle*'s in *Staffordſhire*, where he died not till about 1626? Beſides, in his laſt will and teſtament,

which I have read, he call's himſelf a brother of the *Oratorian* order.

Page 195.

Since in the main you have managed the account [*of F.* Garnet] *tolerably well.*

I am infinitely obliged to you for this acknowledgment. For tho' I have ſet forth the merits of a great number of the *Jeſuits*, both as to their virtue, learning, and zeal, yet this is the only inſtance of your gratitude; and you were in a fair way of ſpoiling the complement by the diminutive term *tolerably*. Proteſtants think his proceedings are incapable of an apology; ſeveral Catholicks are of opinion, they ſtand in need of one. You yourſelves cannot object againſt my account, tho' you ſend me to *Bartoli* for a ſupplement. He may, perhaps, embelliſh matters, and foiſt in ſome miracles, which I have heard of, but cou'd never credit; particularly one of the *miraculous Straw* found under the gallows, with the figure of F. *Garnet*'s head painted upon it: which I have ſeen repreſented in the frontiſpiece of a Book, that gave an account of his death. The original is ſaid to have been kept at St. *Omers:* but now loſt.

Page 196, 197, 198.

Robert Parſons —— *It would have alone blaſted your hiſtory for ever, if you had not given him a great character.* —— *His original writings do, as you here own, ſpeak plainly his temper, and the tendency of his labours: he had*

all, that can be required to compleat the character of an ingenious man, and a zealous aſſertor of the catholick cauſe: his judgment was ſolid and well regulated; he was irreproachable in his morals, and very exact in all the duties of his profeſſion: all his letters are written in a chriſtian ſtile; and tho' a great deal of warmth and mettle may be diſcover'd in ſeveral of his books; they ſeem not to be the effects of reſentment, but of zeal.—— It cannot be reconciled with what you ſay of him here: that his attempts upon the liberties of the Clergy, both in the colleges and upon the miſſion, appear to me an undeniable fact confirmed by all the records I can meet with, as well as by the natural iſſue of his politicks.—— You ſeem to aim at reconciling his zeal and piety with what you call his attempts upon the liberty of the Clergy, by ſaying, the very beſt of men have in all ages been accuſtomed to oppoſe one another, where perſonal and domeſtick intereſt was concern'd. But you ſhould reflect, they did not, they could not, conſiſtently with being the beſt of men, oppoſe one another by a ſeries of enſnaring contrivances, falſe, and injurious characters, deceiving of Popes, miſrepreſenting matters out of private intereſt contrary to the publick good, &c. yet this is what you muſt mean by F. Parſons's *attempts.*

I was in hopes, you would have made me the ſame complement on account of this great man, as you did in the caſe of F. *Garnet*; that I had perform'd my taſk tolerably well; but it ſeem's, tho' I have given a good pail-full of

 milk,

milk, I have kick'd it down with my heel, by making him guilty of ſome attempts againſt the liberties of the Clergy, which, you pretend, deſtroy's the fine character, I had given of him. Had I accuſed him of any palpable injuſtice in thoſe attempts, there would have been ſome difficulty in reconciling matters. But as I diſtinguiſh between his *moral* and *political* character, he may be chargeable with miſbehaviour in one reſpect, without any injury to his character in the other: eſpecially where ignorance, miſinformation, and miſtaken zeal may plead in his favour, and excuſe him at leaſt in part, and from any great offence; as I have fully demonſtrated in my general reply, by the example of the greateſt ſaints, that were excuſed, and had no other way of being excuſed, than by ſuch a method. By way of proof, that I deſtroy his good character, you alledge, that in the attempts I hint at, I make him guilty of enſnaring contrivances, giving injurious characters, miſinforming, and deceiving the Pope, with ſuch like odious matters: which are all fiction, and impoſition, if you mean to charge them upon me. You cannot produce one paſſage in my hiſtory, where I expreſs my ſelf in that manner. Indeed ſome of the *appealing Clergy* ſuſpected both him and his party, and taxed them in the manner you report: but this cannot affect me, who diſclaim ſuch language.

Page

Page 200.

There never was, to his knowledge, either in himſelf, or any other Jeſuit, *any deſire of ſuperiority either over the Arch-prieſt or any of the Clergy.*

This, you ſay, is the proteſtation of F. *Parſons* a little before he died *Ann.* 1610, to the Arch-prieſt *Birket.* You ſeem to wonder, I did not inſert it, among other of his letters, in my *Records.* I was ſo far from being a ſtranger to this letter, that I had the original by me, but threw it by, as being of no ſignification; as I did ſeveral others of his original letters. The reaſons, that induced me to take little notice of it, were the ſame, I here propoſe to the reader: vid. If we take his words as they lye, he clear's himſelf and his brethren not only from any *actual attempt*, but even from any *deſire* of ſuperiority over the Clergy. Some, perhaps, will be puzzled, to reconcile ſuch a proteſtation with a number of facts of a contrary tendency; or that perſons ſhould be pleas'd with, and labour for a thing, they did not *deſire.* Perhaps by *deſire* he only mean's an ambitious, or diſordinate appetite to ſuperiority, or to accept of it without leave of ſuperiors (as the inſtitutions of his order preſcribe;) and in thisI am willing to excuſe him: and, indeed, 'tis the excuſe, he himſelf alledge's in all the attempts, he made againſt the liberties of the Clergy; ſeeing that, upon all occaſions, he has recourſe to the Cardinal *Protector*, and the Pope,

Pope, and make's them only anſwerable for ſuch attempts. But after all, why may it not be ſaid, that this good man made uſe of ſome ſort of *equivocation*; a doctrine, he has maintained in a large treatiſe; and which, he affirm's, may be practiſed upon many ſerviceable occaſions? No other explanation can be given of his words, than theſe I have mentioned, if we conſider, how many attempts the *Jeſuits* are charged with, and convicted of, againſt the liberties of the Clergy; ſome whereof are, as follow's:

Their cajoling with the diſobedient ſcholars, and favouring their petition, to have Dr. *Clenock* turned out from being preſident of the *Roman* college.

F. *Parſons* giving reaſons, and raiſing difficulties *againſt* epiſcopal government in *England*, tho' he had given reaſons *for* it before.

The project of an *Arch-prieſt* generally aſcribed to F. *Parſons*: and the arch-prieſts themſelves owning that they ow'd their promotion to him.

Part of the arch-prieſt's inſtructions was to adviſe with the *Jeſuits* in the government of the *Clergy*.

F. *Parſons* inſtructed the arch-prieſt, what kind of aſſiſtants he was to make uſe of, and who would be proper agents to ſend to *Rome*.

When Agents were ſent to *Rome* from the whole body of the Clergy, F. *Parſons* oppoſed them in many things that were propoſed to ſupport the reputation of their body.

F.

F. *Parſons* frequently went againſt the Pope's orders, which prohibited the *Jeſuits* to meddle with the government of the clergy; and this he was taxed with by his particular friend, the arch-prieſt *Birket*.

F. *Parſons* nominated Dr. *Worthington* to be preſident of *Doway* college, who was conſtantly inſtructed, how to govern the houſe a great part of his time.

Dr. *Worthington* was encouraged by the *Jeſuits* to give the college of *Doway* up to them; and had a mitre offer'd him upon that view.

A *Jeſuit confeſſor* being impoſed upon the clergy of *Doway college* will, by all ſober men, be judged, in it's conſequences, to be an attempt upon the reputation of the clergy.

Scholars being obliged to have a recommendation from the *Superior* of the *Jeſuits*, before they could be admitted into *Doway* college, was a viſible attempt upon the clergy's liberties.

Theſe are a few of thoſe attempts the *Jeſuits* were charged with, againſt the clergy, and were proved to be facts from undeniable records. But that the reader may be particularly acquainted, how F. *Parſons* ſtood affected towards the clergy, I will give a ſhort abſtract of ſome private letters, that paſs'd between him and the arch-prieſt *Birket*, who was his intimate friend, and a ſincere well-wiſher to the Society, tho' he did not approve of their proceedings in regard of the clergy.

F.

F. Parſons *to Mr.* Birket. Rome, May 18, 1608.

I preſumed very much of his [*Lord* Montague's] *approbation: it proceeded out of too much reſpect; and ſhall be amended, God willing, by punctually doing his preſcribed will, without any epieikeia on my part.*

Lord *Montague* had drawn up a petition to the Pope, to eſtabliſh epiſcopal government in *England*, ſigned by the clergy and principal laity: which F. *Parſons*, tho' deſired, refuſed to ſhew to his Holyneſs.

F. Parſons *to Mr.* Birket. Rome, May 31, 1608.

I doubt not, but you ſhall find all my friends [the *Jeſuits*] *to be faithfully your's on all occaſions.——My counſel ſhould be, that before you leave him,* [*Fitzherbert*, hitherto agent for the clergy] *for their* [the clergy's] *ſake, they would provide you with another ſo fit——If you could find one of them* [the clergy] *that would be both confident to you, and current in conformity with us* [Jeſuits] *here, which I ſuppoſe you will hardly do.——If it ſhould be ſo* [that accuſations againſt Dr. *Biſhop* were true] *I doubt it would be taken very ill here, for you to make him an aſſiſtant——You muſt bear yourſelf a ſuperior indifferent to uſe them* [the clergy] *or others,* [notwithſtanding the prohibition of the Pope to conſult *Jeſuits*] *and leave your old friends.*

F.

F. Parſons *to Mr.* Birket. Rome, Aug. 21, 1608.

And aſſure yourſelf, if we be divided, tho' there were twenty agents [from the clergy] here, nothing would be done——whoſoever will come to be agents here, they muſt think, his Holyneſs will hear him [Fitzherbert] formerly agent for the clergy, afterwards a Jeſuit.

F. Parſons *to Mr.* Birket. Rome, Aug. 23, 1608.

This I write to yourſelf alone, to the end you may ſhew the other to your brethren there——— And for your part, I would give you this counſel ——wherein here we will aſſiſt you, what we may ——— this light I thought fit to give you now of the matter.

F. Parſons *to Mr.* Birket. Rome, Sept. 4. 1608.

Tibi Soli.

I thought beſt to add theſe few lines alone to yourſelf.—In which point [of nominating perſons fit to be biſhops] *I muſt adviſe you in confidence, that if any ſhould be named, that may be remember'd, or probably ſuſpected, to have had part in thoſe books, which were ſet forth by the appellants, and which are here in the inquiſition, they will hardly paſs, till they have made their canonical purgation. But this to yourſelf alone.*

F.

F. Parſons *to Mr.* Birket. Rome, Sept. 13, 1608.

For wreſtling here: If any ſuch wreſtlers come here, they may worſe weary themſelves, than hurt other men. For that Rome *is a large ſtable, wherein a horſe may out-labour himſelf in kicking and wincing, without ſtriking others.*

The wreſtlers, here hinted at, were the agents to be ſent by the arch-prieſt, and the clergymen, who were reſolved to ſtruggle hard for the liberties of the clergy.

F. Parſons *to Mr.* Birket. Rome, Oct. 4, 1608.

I wonder, that your ſaid brethren, that are ſo earneſt with you to break off all friendly correſpondence with us here, what good end they can have.

F. Parſons *to Mr.* Birket. Rome, June 6, 1609.

Soli.

Then muſt you remain bound, to impart it with none, except it be with the ſuperior of our fathers there, or ſome other of his company, with his liberty.——For truly, upon my conſcience, I never dealt with any men in my life more heady, and reſolute in their opinions, than is the Doctor [Smith *the Arch-prieſt's Agent*] *whom the other* [*Agent Mr.* More] *in all things ſecondeth.—— not to deal with us——For it had been better for you, to be free, in all men's judgments here—— We find them to be ſureſt to the Appellants both in judgment,*

judgment, and affection: and we do not think, you could eaſily have ſent two others, more paſſionately addicted, than thoſe, out of all your Clergy.

F. *Parſons* to Mr. *Birket. Rome, July* 4, 1609.

In the firſt matter by them [the Agents for the Clergy] propoſed, to wit, forbidding of you to treat with any of our order in matters belonging to your government; tho' I had many reaſons to perſwade me, that it could not be your deſire or benefit, to be ſo bound.

F. *Parſons* to Mr. *Birket. Rome, September* 15, 1609.

Soli.

I do alſo exhort others, to deal with him [Dr. Smith *the agent*] *as from themſelves; and, if it be poſſible, to gain him; tho' we find him to be of a very ſtiff nature, founded on a very good opinion of himſelf——As to think, you were wholly carried away with the other party* [*the clergy*] *but we your friends do mitigate that, and anſwer for you.*

F. *Parſons* to Mr. *Birket. Rome, September* 16, 1609.

You write very earneſtly in both your foreſaid letters, that it would be a great means of peace, if ſome of your brethren here, and there, might be placed in Doway *college.——Could I perſwade my ſelf, that theſe effects would follow of peace, and*

and bettering the college, which you conceive, I ſhall be moſt glad to concurr, and cooperate with you therein —— though the government thereof [Doway *college*] *hath both often, and earneſtly been urged upon us.——I would ask you, what hope of peace, or friendſhip can there be, if having that college in their hands, they ſhould proſecute this diſaffection againſt our fathers. —— I grant he* [*Dr.* Worthington *the Preſident*] *had a certain deſire to give up the government to the ſociety: it was not, nor will not be accepted. Perhaps ſome other religious order* [*the* Benedictin Monks] *near him, will not make ſo great difficulty, to take it, if he offer them the ſame. My inclination is, that it ſhould be maintained, as it was begun, by ſecular prieſts, if any moderate men may be found, that will agree with others, and with ſuch religious, as of neceſſity they muſt have correſpondence with.*

That the reader may be let more into the meaning of this letter, I muſt acquaint him, that the Arch-prieſt, finding, that *Doway* college was entirely governed by the *Jeſuits*, who conſtantly gave inſtructions to the Preſident Dr. *Worthington*, propoſed, that ſome Clergymen might be employed from *England* to aſſiſt, and have more regard for the intereſt of the houſe. F. *Parſons* was not for having a *Jeſuit* to be immediate ſuperior of the college, if Dr. *Worthington* was removed, and honoured with the epiſcopal dignity; but that ſome moderate Clergyman, who would correſpond with the *Jeſuits*, ſhould be made Preſident. And to

this purpoſe there were two candidates ready; Dr. *Norton*, and Dr. *Singleton*; two known creatures of the *Jeſuits*, who for ſeveral years had violently oppoſed the Clergy in *England*, and favour'd all the attempts of the *Jeſuits*. By the religious, whom F. *Parſons* mention's, as being willing to accept of the college, he means the *Benedictin Monks*: who were now ſettled in *Doway*, contrary to the ſollicitations made at *Rome* by *Parſons*, *Fitzherbert*, and *Worthington*, againſt their ſettling there.

F. *Parſons* to Mr. *Birket*. *Rome*, *March* 20, 1610.

I could feel deeply, that you write; that if I ſeek to oppoſe your Agent by falſe informations, you muſt bend yourſelf to defend him, &c. *I did never think to receive from you ſuch a ſpeech.*

This letter, which is dated about a month before F. *Parſons* died, plainly ſhew's the Arch-prieſt's ſuſpicions; and what opinion he had of the *Jeſuit's* attempts againſt the Clergy.

Mr. *Birket* the Arch-prieſt to F. *Parſons*. *January* 8, 1610.

Notwithſtanding I were barr'd from having correſpondence with you in matters of my government, yet I would be always ready to give you my friendly correſpondence—I have anſwer'd the ſame [*all the letters of* F. Parſons] *even in ſuch things concerning my government, as perhaps might have given, to ſome, occaſion of complaint againſt me.*

me.——The contradiction, which you have made againſt my Agent, I leave to your conſcience.--- Is this the way, think you, to preſerve any quietneſs, and peace amongſt us? ——Which might the ſooner be compaſſed, if we could once learn not to love in word, or in tongue, but in deed, and truth. Will your reverence have my poor opinion, what may help much in this matter of uniting us in peace? Let your company, and friends, that be here, ſhew in their countenances as much alacrity for the order, which his Holyneſs hath taken concerning our government, as I and mine have done; and I would not doubt, but that it would be a great provocation to confidence, peace, and concord amongſt us----- Good father, I never as yet have complained of you or your's, but to your ſelf. I truſt, you will ſo prudently handle all matters, as that hereafter, I ſhall never have any occaſion to do it. If you object againſt my Agent things, that are true, I cannot but take it in good part. But if you ſeek to oppreſs him by falſe informations, I muſt bend my ſelf in all due reſpect to your gravity and years, to defend him as well as I can; if he give me no cauſe to the contrary.

Mr. *Birket* Arch-prieſt, to the *Jeſuits* in general in *England*, *April* 3. 1614.

What difference I found, at my firſt entry, between your fathers, who labour with us, and the chiefeſt and moſt ſufficient prieſts [not a few factious Clergymen, as the *Jeſuits* repreſented them] *as I have found by experience:——It reſt-*

eth now only on my part, who wearied with age, and ſore weakened with ſickneſs, as that I am ready to take my laſt farewel [he died the very year in which he wrote this letter] —— *is to intreat, that you would lovingly concur and charitably help the Clergy of this kingdom, for whoſe aſſiſtance you were firſt ſent into this harveſt. I know, your profeſſion is honourable in God's church, your labours againſt hereſy and ſin commendable: but if peace, and charity guide not your endeavours, we labour in vain.* —— *I have dealt with the chiefeſt of my own, whom I know, you have held in greater jealouſy, than there is cauſe. And to deal plainly and ſincerely with you, I find them moſt ready, to give you that correſpondence is neceſſary you ſhould give one another, who travel in ſo holy a work. They only deſire, that in their government you meddle no farther, than they do in your's: withal, that you oppoſe not yourſelves in any ſuit, they propoſe to the chief Paſtor, for the good of their own body; eſpecially in matters of ſuperiority, which canonically belongeth to their vocation.*

F. *Creſwell*, a ſuperior of the *Jeſuits* at *Madrid*, to Dr. *Worthington*, Preſident of *Doway* college, *January* 30, 1608.

It is the Devil, who tempt's now by way of lewd perſons, under pretence of a Monk's *cowl, what he could not before effect by Appellant's cloaks.* —— *Except they* [that deſire to be admitted into *Doway* college] *bring ſome extra-*

ordinary

ordinary commendations, we leave it to your diſcretion, to let them paſs, as they come.

There had been an order from the Cardinal, that ſcholars, before they could be admitted into the college at *Doway*, ſhould have a recommendation from a ſuperior of the *Jeſuits*. In purſuance of this order, F. *Creſwel* cautioneth Dr. *Worthington* not to receive certain ſcholars, that came from *Spain*, upon any ordinary commendations. The reaſon he give's, is becauſe thoſe, that were a coming, were too much friends to the *Monks*.

Dr. *William Singleton*, a Clergyman, to F. *Floyd*, a *Jeſuit*, at *Lisboe*, *April* 9, 1609.

My Couſin Gerard *having appointed me to keep correſpondence with you.——I will therefore ſatisfy your deſire hereafter by the poſts in relating every particular news, we learn from* England. *——There is at this time come over, about biſhops, Dr.* Smith, *Mr.* Thomas More, *and another —— theſe two firſt are gone by* Paris, *that they may communicate counſels. They are deſperate: for they give out, that they will not return homewards to* England *again, unleſs they prevail.——With whom, Mr. Dr.* Norton *is to encounter, who for that purpoſe is either gone or to go preſently, from* Pontamuſſon *to* Rome. *We here in* Flanders, *provide to prevent their intended plot by our letters, with the firſt poſt.*

I ſhall only obſerve, that Dr. *Norton*, and Dr. *Singleton* were the two moderate Clergy-

men, who were intended to ſucceed Dr. *Worthington* by the appointment of F. *Parſons* and the *Jeſuits*. And I don't queſtion, but the reader will obſerve, what ſort of clergymen they were, who oppoſed the good deſigns of their own chief ſuperior the *Arch-prieſt*, when, in conjunction with his aſſiſtants and the reſt of the Clergy, he ſent the Agents to *Rome*.

Mr. *Pilkington* Paſtor in *Valenciennes* to Mr. *Steward*. *Sept.* 30, 1612.

Mr. William Singleton *dealt with me to ſpeak unto the Preſident* [*Dr.* Worthington] *about it* [*about delivering up* Doway *college*] *and withal told me that he had authority from the fathers ſo to do.*——*The Rector of the* Jeſuits *in* Valenciennes *ſaid, I might do well to perſwade Mr. Preſident thereto; and it would be grateful unto the ſociety. And I dealt thus with the Preſident: and this is all I ſaid; and this is true: whereby one may eaſily ſee, that the fathers would have it.*——*They deſired me to put it down in writing; and ſo I did.*

Dr. *Cæſar Clement* to Dr. *Kelliſon* Preſident of *Doway* college, *June* 26, 1616.

Your labouring ſo hard for the removal of their ghoſtly father, and to bring in Dr. Smith, *their profeſſed enemy, ſay they,* [*the* Jeſuits] *did ſufficiently diſcover you to be no good willer of theirs; and hath made you ſo ſuſpected unto them, as it*

ſeemeth they had rather ſee another in your place. For thoſe two Doctors, [Norton, *and* Singleton] *you wrote of, they defend them tooth and nail; and cry out of open injury, that they ſhould be condemned to be removed inauditi; and ſay, you ſhall have ſhortly orders à protectore melius informato.*

When the contents of the aforeſaid letters are laid together, and duly conſidered; I believe every intelligent reader will conclude, that I neither impoſed upon F. *Parſons* nor upon the *Jeſuits*, when I have charged them with attempts againſt the liberties of the Clergy. And this was not the complaint of a few factious and uneaſy perſons of that body, but a remonſtrance of the Arch-prieſt, his 12 aſſiſtants, jointly with all the eminent Clergymen in *England*. As for F. *Parſons*, I have hinted at ſome methods, whereby he may preſerve the character of a virtuous man: but if there appear's to be any inconſiſtence in the account I have given of him; I leave it to his friends, to reconcile his proteſtations with his original letters, I have produced.

Page 201.

For, next to God, F. Parſons *made me* [*Dr.* Allen] *Cardinal. Learn from this great and excellent Cardinal, true ſentiments of love, and gratitude.*

And do you, *Clerophilus*, learn from this inſtance of F. *Parſons*, not to repreſent it as *a whim* and *imagination* of mine, that *Jeſuits* are men of great power; ſeeing that one ſingle

member of that ſociety had intereſt enough with the Pope to make a Cardinal; or that the Clergy may be in danger of loſing their cauſe in the court of *Rome*, when they have ſuch powerful adverſaries to contend with. Both the Clergy, and all the Catholicks of *England* ought to return thanks to God for that good man's promotion; and the *Engliſh Jeſuits* in particular, who were firſt perſwaded to labour upon the miſſion by Dr. *Allen*, after near twenty years delay; during which time the Clergy had born the burden of the day. We never can ſufficiently admire the power of F. *Parſons* upon this occaſion; ſince the power of nominating Cardinals is commonly allowed only to crowned heads; and yet not always granted: as we have an inſtance in King *James* II. who could not prevail with the Pope to make F. *Petre* a Cardinal, after reiterated requeſts: and one of the reaſons he gave for not promoting him, was, becauſe he cou'd not do *it in conſcience*, as I find it in the Pope's letter to king *James*. So different is the opinion of the court of *Rome* in regard of the merits of ſome of the ſociety,; and ſo different is the character I give of their ſociety in general, from that, I am obliged to give of ſome of their meddling brethren.

Page 203, 204, 205, 206.

The Clergy had diſcovered, that Mr. Fitzherbert *had conſtantly conſulted* F. Parſons, *and the* Jeſuits, *in all matters relating to the Clergy; and that too, contrary to the expreſs order lately and*

directed to the Arch-prieſt from Rome. *It is true, ſuch orders were given to the Arch-prieſt; but none ſuch had been given to Mr.* Fitzherbert. *He was at liberty to conſult what perſons he thought fit.* ——— *It is a mere jeſt, to make their correſpondence a diſcovery* —— *that this correſpondence had been very prejudicial both to the intereſt, and reputation of the Clergy, as it was made appear by ſeveral inſtances. Now, ſir, be pleaſed to attend. I abſolutely affirm that no ſuch thing was ever made to appear; and I here publickly defy you, to produce any one ſuch inſtance.* ——— *That Mr.* Fitzherbert *was an improper perſon to be employed by the Clergy, appear'd a few years after,* viz. *Ann.* 1614. *when he pull'd off the maſk and became a* Jeſuit. *This way of expreſſion naturally implie's, that he had been guilty of inſincerity, and of ſuch unfair dealings, as wanted a maſk.* ——— *What would you think of one, that ſhould ſpeak of Dr.* Clement, *as you do of Mr.* Fitzherbert? *Suppoſe I ſhould ſay (which I am far from either ſaying or thinking) that the Dr. was diſcover'd to have been playing artfully the Clergy's game; and having by ſpinning a fine thread of politicks, and by myſterious ſteps, made the* Jeſuits *neglect their intereſt, he at length flung off the maſk,* &c.

I have given ſo great a character of Mr. *Fitzherbert*, both as to learning, and virtue, that nothing cou'd be more ſatisfactory in one, who never deſign'd to be ſo particular in the paſſages of his life, as you upon this and all other occaſions ſeem to expect. What I ſay of him, that ſo much diſpleaſe's you, only re-

gard's his *Political behaviour*. That he conſtantly conſulted F. *Parſons* and the *Jeſuits* in the affairs of the Clergy, is what he himſelf frequently own's. That the Arch-prieſt was forbidden by the Pope to conſult the *Jeſuits* in the government of the Clergy, was acknowledged by both parties. But when you ſay, Mr. *Fitzherbert* was not forbidden by this to conſult with the *Jeſuits*, it is a ſtrange kind of aſſertion. It may be the order was not expreſsly directed to him by name. But was he not the Arch-prieſt's Agent? Did not the order affect him, as ſuch? Cou'd the Arch-prieſt be ſaid to comply with the Pope's order, if he employ'd ſuch Agents, as wou'd conſult with the *Jeſuits*? I know, both F. *Parſons*, and Mr. *Fitzherbert* urged vehemently, that the order only regarded the government of the Clergy; but that friendly correſpondence was not prohibited. But time diſcovered a ſecret. Under a pretence of friendly correſpondence F. *Parſons* endeavour's to elude the force of the order, and plainly propoſe's ſchemes for governing the Clergy, which the Arch-prieſt Mr. *Birket* very much complain's of; and accuſe's himſelf for being trapann'd that way, by too much encouraging a friendly correſpondence. You pretend, the diſcovery of the correſpondence between F. *Parſons* and Mr. *Fitzherbert*, is a jeſt: becauſe it never was made a ſecret of. It might, perhaps, be no ſecret to a great many in *Rome*; but the generality of the Clergy in *England* had only a ſuſpicion of it, till the

matter

matter was detected, and cou'd no longer be concealed. But the moſt heinous part of your accuſation is ſtill to come. I have moſt wickedly affirm'd, that Mr. *Fitzherbert*, for a certain time, wore a maſk, (which is an odd kind of an accuſation in thoſe, that allow of equivocations, and mental reſervations) and that ſuch an expreſſion is highly injurious to ſo good a man. A *maſk* may be put on upon ſeveral occurrences. By villains, and aſſaſſins: to hide ſome deformity: to preſerve the complexion: or upon any other ſerviceable occaſion. In a *moral Senſe* it import's any ſort of concealment, but moſt eſpecially that of underhand dealings. Now, upon the word of an honeſt man, when I happened to hint, Mr. *Fitzherbert wore a maſk*, I did not think, he had a deſign upon any man's life. I intended no more, but that, whereas before he did ſeveral things clandeſtinly, that favour'd the *Jeſuits* to the prejudice of the Clergy, (and which the Clergy, that employed him, would not have allowed of, had they known the man) he afterwards acted more openly, and profeſſed himſelf not only a favourer of the *Jeſuits* deſigns and intereſt, but one of the body. Now that he wore ſuch a *maſk*, or, in ſofter terms, conceal'd his underhand dealings, in favour of the *Jeſuits*, till he was more fully detected, I will demonſtrate in due place from his own original letters, after I have taken notice of the parallel you make between Dr. *Clement* and Mr. *Fitzherbert* as to wearing a *maſk*. I own the parallel is juſt in the

the main, tho' their motives were different. Dr. *Clement*'s deſign was to re-eſtabliſh the liberties of the clergy; but not againſt his commiſſion: Mr. *Fitzherbert* was inclin'd to favour, and did favour the oppreſſive methods of their adverſaries. They both were *Politicians*; and both wore a *maſk*. But it was ſo, that Dr. *Clement* acted nothing contrary to the truſt repoſed in him: but Mr. *Fitzherbert* did it very zealouſly. You may, perhaps, have heard of a ſaying of king *Charles* II. when he was told, that *F. T.* had carried off fifteen hundred pounds, that belong'd to your body: *Nothing but a diamond*, ſay's he, *can cut a diamond.*

Extracts of ſeveral original letters of Mr. Fitzherbert, *whereby it will appear, that while he was Agent for the Clergy, he favour'd the* Jeſuits, *to the prejudice of that body; and was not a fit Agent for them.*

Mr. *Fitzherbert* to the Arch-prieſt Mr. *Birket*, *May* 18, 1608.

We preſumed too far on the confidence we thought he repoſed in us.

Mr. *Fitzherbert* and F. *Parſons* refuſed to ſhew the Pope the general petition of the clergy for biſhops.

Mr.

Mr. *Fitzherbert* to the Arch-prieſt Mr. *Birket*, *May* 31, 1608.

We ſhall not be able to propoſe good offices to any purpoſe, if your Agent be not united to us.

Mr. *Fitzherbert* to Dr. *Worthington* Preſident of *Doway* college, *Auguſt* 2, 1608.

Tibi Soli.

I muſt, in confidence, deſire you, to advertiſe me, whether, if his Holyneſs ſhould reſolve to make ſome biſhops for our country, wherein of late he has been greatly urged from England, *you would be content for God's greater glory and ſervice, that the dignity ſhould be impoſed upon you.*

Mr. *Fitzherbert* to the Arch-prieſt Mr. *Birket*, *Auguſt* 23, 1608.

I muſt needs ſay, that the reaſons you add to the demand [*of the Agents*] *cannot but diſguſt his Holyneſs.——I do aſſure you, and I do promiſe ſo much for F.* Parſons, *that I will moſt willingly acknowlege my fault, and crave pardon* [for not preſenting the petition for biſhops] *when I ſhall ſee juſt cauſe.*

Mr. *Fitzherbert* to Dr. *Worthington*, Preſident of *Doway* college, *September* 6, 1608.

They [*the Benedictin* Monks] *object againſt you,*

you, in their own defence, that you are altogether ruled in this matter [of hindering the *Benedictin Monks from ſettling in* Doway] *by F.* Parſons, *and the* Jeſuits.——*I ſtill inſiſt* —— *there can be none* [no compoſition between the *Monks* and Dr. *Worthington*] *made with you, but to remove either them or you* [from *Doway*.]

Mr. *Fitzherbert* to the Arch-prieſt Mr. *Birket*, *October* 4, 1608.

Some do much miſlike your correſpondence with me no leſs, or rather more, than with F. Parſons.

Mr. *Fitzherbert* to the Arch-prieſt Mr. *Birket*, *May* 23, 1609.

The truth is, I have made ſome difficulty to make ſuit, that you ſhould be directly bound not to conſult with the fathers.

Mr. *Fitzherbert* to the Arch-prieſt Mr. *Birket*, *June* 27, 1609.

Dr. Smith [the Arch-prieſt's and Clergy's Agent] *requeſted me not to hinder it; tho' I dare not further it, and ſhould be loath to be thought, to have a hand in it.*

Formerly an order came from *Rome*, that Clergy miſſioners ſhould not take accademical degrees. The Clergy, having found by experience, that it leſſened the reputation of their body,

body, join with the arch-prieſt to have that order recalled: but Mr. *Fitzherbert* refuſed to concurr.

Mr. *Fitzherbert* to the arch-prieſt Mr. *Birket*, *September* 19, 1609.

To the depoſition of the preſident [Dr. Worthington] *and other deſignments, I cannot but ſay I am very ſorry, to ſee ſuch intentions in any of our brethren; and ſpecially in yourſelf——whereas you ſignify in your poſtſcript, that your brethren there held me either to be a* Jeſuit, *or diſpoſed thereto; wherein you wiſh me alſo to give Dr.* Smith [*the clergy's agent*] *ſatisfaction.—— However it is, I ſhall be very well content, that Mr. Dr. here, or any of our brethren with you, ſhall take that exception againſt me——no advice of mine, or your old friend* [Parſons] *can any thing at all prevail with him* [Dr. Smith the arch-prieſt's agent.]

Mr. *Fitzherbert* to the arch-prieſt, Mr. *Birket*, *October* 30, 1609.

Rumours have been ſpread there amongſt our brethren, that I and your old friend [Parſons] *have croſſed Dr.* Smith *in his petitions.—— And though it were true, which you ſay is there reported, and he* [*Dr.* Smith] *it ſeemeth, ſuppoſe's——yet he ſhould have no reaſon to doubt of the equity of his Holineſs's judgment.*

Mr.

Mr. *Fitzherbert* to the arch-prieſt Mr. *Birket*, *November* 21. 1609.

Wherein you ſay you had written ſomewhat roundly unto me——you ſay in your poſtſcript, that if I be not of the Society, as many think I am, you muſt enjoyn me to concurr with Dr. Smith, *in ſuch things as you and your brethren there, ſhall think convenient: and if I be of the Society, then I am not fit to be uſed of yours—— Neither you there, (if I may be bold to ſay it) nor Mr. Dr. here, for ought I ſee, may be like to know ſo well as I* [how things are to be managed with the court of *Rome*]——*If any man think, that I take myſelf to be honoured by it,* [by being your agent] *he is greatly deceived.*

Mr. *Fitzherbert* to the arch-prieſt, Mr. *Birket*, *June* 18, 1610.

I ſhould be loath that Mr. Dr. Smith *ſhould confer about your buſineſs with me, untill I ſhould ſee him more apt to take advice and follow counſel——Concerning the college of* Doway (*which toucheth me moſt) wherein I muſt, much againſt my will, be an adverſary to you, or any that ſhall any way impugn the authority or government of the Preſident.*

Some few remarks are requiſite to explain the meaning of theſe letters. I ſhall only advertiſe the reader, that when the arch-prieſt and the clergy ſent their Agents, Dr. *Smith* and Mr. *More*, to *Rome*, it was partly to examine Mr.

Mr. *Fitzherbert*'s conduct, who had hitherto been agent, and might have been continued jointly with them, had they found him willing to aſſiſt them: but as he diſappointed them, he was diſcarded, as an unfit Perſon.

Page 206.

If he [Fitzherbert] *had been ſuch a man as you repreſent him ——would the* Jeſuits *have been ſo unwiſe, as to make him Rector of a ſeminary of the ſame order?*

In my poor opinion (and I believe in the opinion of all others, that will give themſelves time to think) the *Jeſuits* could not act more wiſely, than to make him *Rector*. I repreſent him as a Politician, who could conceal his deſigns, and upon occaſion, as I expreſs it, wear a *maſk*. Now, who was more proper to inſtil into young clergymen notions leſs favourable to their Body, than one that was ſuch an adept in theſe ways, and had for ſome years been a practitioner in them; and ſo ſucceſsful, as even to bring over ſeveral ancient clergymen to his party? Pray, Sir, cannot you fit your remarks a little more to the purpoſe?

Page 212.

On your lives of F. Oldcorn, *Brother* Owen, *and F.* Gerard.

You find not any thing to reproach me with on account of theſe perſons, but that I am too ſhort, and have omitted ſome things, and have called *Owen*, *Oldcorn*'s ſervant; whereas you ſay, one *Aſhley* was his ſervant.

Owen was a Lay-Brother of the Society, and occaſionally a ſervant to them in ſeveral parts of *England:* whether particularly to *Oldcorn* or no, at that time, I will not ſay; but ſo I find him recorded. I ſay nothing of certain miracles, you aſcribe to F. *Oldcorn*; eſpecially that, you expreſs in the following words: *After which, from the place where his heart and bowels were burnt, there aroſe a lively flaming fire for ſixteen days together; never extinguiſh'd either by the conſumption of the matter near it, or by the heavy rains, that fell during that time.* I neither queſtion the power of God, nor the ſanctity of the perſon; but for the credit of the Catholick cauſe, as well as of your own, I wiſh you had brought ſome vouchers, and ſupported the ſtory by a good foundation. You ſay alſo I am too ſhort in the account I give of F. *Gerard*, a perſon of great account of your order. I cou'd have ſaid much more of him, tho' perhaps not to his advantage. Meantime, may not you be charged with omiſſions, who ſpeaking of his impriſonment and being put upon the rack, ſay not a word of the crime he was accuſed of, in having a hand in the gun-powder plot?

Page 221.

Of Mr. Bennet, Hunt, *and* Brown —— *Since you ſpeak of two others, both named* John Bennet, *how came you to omit their name-ſake, of whom I am going to ſpeak?*

The account you give of this *John Bennet*, is nothing but blunders, and miſtakes from the beginning

beginning to the end. You pretend I ſay nothing of him; whereas you may find I not only mention him page 72. vol. II. but relate ſeveral paſſages of his life, exactly copied out from the diary of *Doway* college and Dr. *Bridgwater*'s Concertatio, *&c. vid*, that he was enter'd ſtudent in *Doway* college *an.* 1576. made prieſt and ſent upon the miſſion in 1580, impriſon'd and tortured in *Flint* caſtle *ann.* 1582, thence ſent to the *Tower* of *London*, whence he was baniſhed *an.* 1585. All theſe particulars either you were ignorant of, or thought fit to conceal; and only obſerve, that he was a Layman before he enter'd into the noviceſhip of the Society at 36 years of age, *ann.* 1586. From whence you had this falſe account, I cannot tell: neither do you ſignify. But that you have no good memoirs, is apparent from the calculation of time; ſince you make him alive ſome years, after he was dead. As for Mr. *Hunt* I reſpect his memory according to the account you give of him: as alſo of brother *Browne*, who, you ſay, *preſerved his baptiſmal innocence free from any mortal ſin.* A great character, indeed; which neither you, nor I can be judge of. Such particulars came not under my conſideration.

Page 229.

A few inſtances ſhall ſuffice; and thoſe from that article only, which you call records of the Jeſuits.

There cannot be a more convincing proof of the weakneſs of your cauſe, than the little notice you take of that number of letters I

produce from F. *Parſons* and F. *Fitzherbert*; which plainly diſcover the attempts, that were made againſt the liberties of the clergy. But as they were originals you had no other way, than to paſs matters over in ſilence. The moſt unparalleled aſſurance cannot withſtand ſuch proofs. But let us examin thoſe few exceptions, you make.

Page 230.

He [Parſons] *deſire's Mr.* Birket *will not name him.*

He was in the right, to give this caution on account of the contents of his letters; which gave directions to Mr. *Birket* concerning the government of the Clergy, which was poſitively forbidden by repeated orders from the Pope.

Page 230.

I have been ever a favourer of this motion for biſhops.-- I do proteſt unto you, that I do not only protect and favour it, but alſo deſire it.

F. *Parſons* was of different opinions at different times, as to having biſhops in *England*. At firſt he not only favour'd the deſign, but gave ſeveral reaſons for it. But the project of an *Arch-prieſt* gave a more commodious turn to his politicks. When afterwards the Clergy of *England* ſeemed uneaſy, till they had a biſhop, F. *Parſons* diſcovered his inclinations, by refuſing to preſent to his Holyneſs a general petition of lord *Montague* and the principal perſons of the laity for that purpoſe: and gave his

his reaſons to Mr. *Birket*, that ſuch an undertaking cou'd not be carried on without diſpleaſing *ſome Party*.

Page 231.

My inclination is, that it [Doway College] *ſhould be maintain'd, as it was begun, under the ſecular prieſts.*

This will not prove to be an inſtance of any affection, he had for the body of the Clergy. At that time F. *Parſons* own's, Dr. *Worthington* offered to give up the college into the *Jeſuits* hands. It farther appear's from Mr. *Pilkinton's* letter, that the *Jeſuits* put perſons upon perſwading him to it; and that offering him a mitre, was to induce him to ſurrender it. F. *Parſons*, indeed, ſay's, it was not with any intention of diſplacing the Clergy entirely, or that the *Jeſuits* would accept of it: but that ſome Clergyman better diſpoſed might be made Preſident. But this you endeavour to conceal from your readers, by leaving out thoſe words of F. *Parſons*, which immediately follow in the quotation: *viz. If any moderate men* [of the Clergy] *may be found, that will agree with others, and with ſuch religious, as of neceſſity they muſt have correſpondence with.* Is this any token of F. *Parſon's* inclination to ſerve the Clergy, when at that time the Arch-prieſt and the clergy in *England* were endeavouring to have the college govern'd by ſuch of their body, as wou'd not correſpond with the *Jeſuits*?

Page 233, 234

A memorial to Paul V. *by Dr.* William Harriſon *arch-prieſt and his aſſiſtant's.* December

20,

20, 1619.—*This I will abſolutely conclude of it* [that 'tis not genuine] *till you bring undoubted proofs that it was really theirs.*

What you mean, by undoubted proofs, I don't well underſtand. Wou'd you have me ſay, that I was their *Amanuenſis*, or that the memorial is an *original*? I do not pretend either. At the ſame time, I hope you will not ſuggeſt, that it was a forgery of mine. As for your doubts of it's being a true copy, they will appear to be groundleſs, and inſignificant. You ſay, I don't mention, where I found it. Where ſhould I find it, but among other records of the clergy, tho' I do not name the place? A circumſtance that would not have render'd it more authentick in your opinion. As for the ſtile being too modern for thoſe times, 'tis too general a remark to be mentioned as a proof. We often meet with ſpeeches, and addreſſes, where tranſcribers take the liberty to inſert equivalent words without altering the ſenſe; though I don't take this to be the caſe in the memorial. Again, you ſay, I make Doctor *Harriſon* to be at *good Terms* with the *Jeſuits*; which you pretend is contrary to what is contained in the memorial. If by good *Terms* is meant a friendly and charitable correſpondence, he was always at good terms with the *Jeſuits*. If by *good Terms* be meant, that he agreed to their *Terms* againſt the Clergy, he was far otherwiſe. His predeceſſor, Mr. *Birket*, was at good terms with F. *Parſons* and the whole Society in general,

whom he reverenced and loved to the day of his death: yet he oppoſed all their contrivances for bringing the Clergy under ſubjection to them. You farther alledge, that the memorial from the beginning to the end is down right reproaching the Popes for continuing the *Jeſuits* ſuperiors over the college. This is a plain miſrepreſentation both of this memorial, and of all the other remonſtrances, made by the Clergy: wherein they only deſired, his Holyneſs wou'd conſider the inconveniences and abuſes, that the Clergy had obſerved from a mal-adminiſtration of thoſe colleges; leaving it to his wiſdom to redreſs the evil, and put the Clergy under a better inſpection. What is mentioned in the memorial concerning St. *Charles*'s *Seminary*, thus much of it is undoubted fact: that tho' at firſt he employed a *Jeſuit* to be ſuperior, he afterwards changed his mind, and removed him. What his real motive was, I do not pretend to know; only thus far: it was commonly reported, that they decoyed ſeveral of the young Clergymen to enter into their order, which St. *Charles* did not reliſh. This account being recorded by ſeveral writers, was the occaſion that the memorial take's notice of it, as a parallel caſe. In oppoſition to this, you remit me to a ſtring of *Jeſuits*, *Lancicius*, *Sacchinus*, *Giuſano*, *Adorni*, *Crucius*, and many more, you name not. But what is it, they ſay? they inform me, that St. *Charles* had a great reſpect for the *Jeſuits*, and employed 'em upon ſeveral occaſions; which will be readily granted. But

what is this to the fact in debate? Do they ſay, St. *Charles* did not remove them from his Seminary, for decoying his Clergy? Yes, ſay you, F. *Crucius*, the *Jeſuit*, that was removed, gave it under his hand to another *Jeſuit*, that he reſigned willingly; and that St. *Charles* begg'd, that one of the ſociety might ſtill be continued ſuperior. This relation is very much to be ſuſpected, for ſeveral reaſons. Wou'd the *Jeſuits* refuſe the earneſt requeſt of St. *Charles*, who were ſo well pleaſed with ſuperiority over other ſeminaries? He might not be unwilling to continue them, after giving them a reprimand, and taking care that they ſhould not decoy his Clergy for the future. Beſides, it look's very ſuſpicious, that the *Jeſuits* ſhould preſs F. *Crucius* to ſign a writing, that he went cleanly off, and not for any miſbehaviour. After all, I leave the reader to judge, how far I have tranſgreſſed the laws of hiſtory, by inſerting among the records of the Clergy a memorial ſign'd by the *Arch-prieſt* and his aſſiſtants; a memorial conformable to all the other remonſtrances made at ſeveral times by the Clergy: A memorial, in fine, where nothing is wanting to make it paſs for genuine, and no objection againſt it, beſides ſome cavilling remarks of no force, and ſignification.

Page 237.

Both the compiler and his favourers will not be a little aſtoniſhed to ſee ſuch great and numerous faults in his work.

Great aſtoniſhment there was, when the mountain brought forth a mouſe: and great aſtoniſhment there was, when *Clerophilus* was deliver'd of his *Specimen*. Not only the *Compiler*, and his favourers, but all Catholicks whatever, even your greateſt friends, were not only aſtoniſhed, but ſcandalized at your attempt in general, in decrying a hiſtory ſo well deſigned, and ſo effectually perform'd for the good of the catholick cauſe; and much more at the method you took, by defamations, and abuſive reflexions upon perſons of the greateſt worth. As for any one being aſtoniſh'd at your pretended numerous faults, 'twas what they expected. The only thing, they were aſtoniſh'd at, was, that a perſon of your profeſſion, pretended ſincerity, abilities and learnin ſhould be detected to have made ſo many trifling remarks, with fraudulent dealings, and a want of common underſtanding, as you are manifeſtly convicted of in this reply.

Page 238.

It is viſible, you have been induſtrious to ſet off your

your work with a great number of very conſiderable men of the Clergy.

And 'tis as viſible, that you have attack'd the reputation of many conſiderable men, by declaring, they are obliged to recant, and make ſatisfaction for promoting a work, which you pretend is highly ſcandalous and injurious to your ſociety.

Page 242.

Talk as much as you pleaſe of looſe caſuiſts; none, I am ſure, can excuſe you from this obligation.

I don't remember to have talked either much or little, in my hiſtory, of looſe caſuiſts. I ſuppoſe you mention them out of fear, leſt I ſhould have recourſe to ſome of them for abſolution, and by that means eſcape out of your hands. I might, 'tis true, have had encouragement to come off pretty well in many other caſes, where your *Caſuiſts* are very merciful: but in my caſe, where any of the Society is attack'd, there is little mercy to be expected. The cry is: *Lord have mercy upon him: take him goaler.* However, I cannot ſay, but my brother *Clerophilus* has ſomething of compaſſion in his anger. He only enjoyn's me, by way of ſatisfaction, to make a general acknowledgment, that no one is to give credit to any thing, I ſay in my hiſtory, againſt any of his brethren, upon

upon my own word, without ſome better authority. Now tho' this may ſeem to reflect very much upon my honour; yet to ſhew, how well I am diſpoſed to give content to all ſorts of readers, I willingly acquieſce to what is propoſed: and, as I have in all my accounts quoted my authors for all things, that ſeem to be of any moment; ſo I deſire, that my hiſtory may be cenſur'd upon that iſſue; and that my own authority may not be regarded in ſuch matters. After all, this comfort I have ſtill; that as my condemnation is only conditional, I live in hopes of a conditional abſolution upon a rehearing of the cauſe.

Page 243.

It will not excuſe them [the favourers of the hiſtory] *to ſay, they have taken their notions from ſuch writers, as you.——It is no leſs certain, that thoſe who have encouraged or promoted your work, will, upon better information of the prejudice it may do, be obliged to make amends for their having been inſtrumental in ſpreading ſo pernicious writings.*

'Tis only thoſe, are inexcuſable in the falſe notions they have of things, who are wholly taken up in reading, quoting, and praiſing their own writers, with a prohibition of peruſing any others of a contrary party, that might give them further intelligence; and make them more capable to judge of the merits of a cauſe. The

ſame

ſame politick method is obſerved in regard of all, that are influenced by them, and under their direction; who are commonly forbidden either to read, or purchaſe ſuch books, as might contribute towards ſetting them right in ſeveral matters; where falſe notions had taken poſſeſſion of them to the prejudice of truth. To carry on this contrivance, their way is, to buy up, commit to the flames, and uſe ſeveral other uncommendable methods, to hinder the ſpreading of ſuch books, as wou'd give proper intelligence, in order to eſtabliſh the reputation of their own writers. This I apprehend may be the fate of my *Reply:* there being no other way left to ſupport the credit of your *Specimen.*

On the other hand: As for thoſe noblemen and gentlemen, who have been pleas'd to favour my work, they have quite a different way of thinking. They are under no obligation of following this, or that writer. Their curioſity, as well as thirſt after truth, engage's them to read what is publiſh'd on both ſides the queſtion. They examine their motives, handle and weigh every argument, and conſider every circumſtance in order to form a true judgment of the cauſe. Their characters are ſo well known as to capacity, learning, and virtue, that I believe, you are the only perſon, that can make any exception againſt them; and whatever freedom you have taken with me, to drag me before your tribunal, and pronounce me unpardonable,

till

till I make ſatisfaction; both good manners and juſtice required of you, not to bring thoſe worthy perſons under the ſame arbitrary cenſure. The ſatisfaction you demand from them, is: to repent; to ſignify their *concern* for being accomplices; to endeavour to *put a ſtop* to the ſpreading of the hiſtory; and openly to *declare* againſt it. I am perſonally acquainted with ſome of thoſe worthy gentlemen, tho' a ſtranger to many of them. How far they are diſpoſed to obey your orders, I cannot tell. If, upon comparing this *Reply* with your *Specimen*, they ſhould become more convinced of the truth and impartiality of the hiſtory, (as you have reaſon to apprehend) your magiſterial cenſure will ſcarce bring them upon their knees. Mean time they are their own directors: and have a right to judge both of you and me.

Page 244.

For my own part, if I have done any injury to you, Sir, or to others; if I have miſrepreſented or miſunderſtood any words, or facts, I ſincerely declare, as I did in the Preface, it has been unknowingly; and that upon notice of it, I will make all the ſatisfaction for it, that can be required.

Your unfair and unſincere dealings, which I have ſo frequently diſcover'd in your *Specimen*, make me vehemently ſuſpect your *candour*. I cannot think, you are ſo ignorant, and thought-

thoughtleſs, as not to find out, how much you have injur'd both me and many others; or that you are rightly diſpoſed, to ſubmit to any conviction, that will make you ſenſible of the obligation, you lye under of making ſatisfaction. However, ſince you pretend to have an inclination that way, I accept of your offer; and will lay before you a *Table* of tranſgreſſions, you have been guilty of, wherein ſatisfaction will be required.

But in the firſt place, to eaſe you of ſome trouble and concern upon this occaſion; I require no ſatisfaction for thoſe trifling and pedantick remarks, which make up a great part of your *Specimen.* They carry along with them their own puniſhment. The ſame indulgence I grant to the pains, you take in repreſenting me to be an ignorant, raſh, inconſiderate writer. Nor am I very ſollicitous about your miſrepreſentations, and fraudulent way of arguing.

What I think proper to call you to a ſtrict account for, are matters of a greater conſequence; which will prove, you endeavour'd to do me the greateſt injury imaginable. Do you remember the proteſtation, you made particularly *page* 9. that you would keep cloſe to good *Manners*, and uſe no *harſh Expreſſions.* You have not, 'tis true, call'd me knave, fool, or heretick; (ſuch language not becoming a profeſſor of

of *polite, and agreeable converſation)* but then you make uſe of deſcriptions, which anſwer the ends, and, in malignity, far ſurpaſs thoſe ſcandalous appellations. Do you not compare me to the moſt infamous writers, that were ſtigmatized for lying, and irreligion? Do you not repreſent me, as an adverſary to religious orders, and particularly as having defam'd the order of *Jeſuits?* when in reality I have only given our Clergy a caution of your deſigning buſy politicians, and their readineſs to ſupplant and ſubdue us. Do you not, upon many occaſions, tax me with diſreſpect to the See of *Rome*, and want of regard to it's decrees? Do you not, in fine, pronounce me to be ſo notorious an offender, that I am incapable of abſolution, unleſs I recant, and make publick ſatisfaction? Is there no *Harſhneſs* in ſuch language, as this? Is there no *injury* in ſuch aſperſions? What ſatisfaction will you make either to me, or to thoſe worthy perſons, whom you have aſpers'd with the ſame calumnies? How will you remove the ſcandal, you have given to catholicks, by vilifying a hiſtory, which they have hitherto read with great comfort, and edification? What opinion will catholicks have of a writer, who appear's at the head of the enemies of the catholick cauſe, and give's them a handle to attack it? You ſee, therefore, to whom, and in what, ſatisfaction is required from you. 'Tis well, if you comply with your promiſe. If not, there will be no diſappointment.

ment. A thouſand injuſtices are committed every day; but we ſeldom hear of any reſtitution.

January 25, 1741, O. S.

F I N I S.

To be added after line 4. pag. 76.

Oeconomy properly is the management or government of a private family: but is applied to Towns and Provinces. When I ſaid, *The Heptarchy was the Oeconomy of our Anceſtors*, my meaning was, that the nation was *govern'd* by ſeven abſolute independent governors, or kings. This indeed implie's *the diviſion* of the nation into ſeven kingdoms, but does not ſignify it. And if you make no diſtinction between the Government of *Yorkſhire*, and the diviſion of it into Ridings, the reader muſt conclude, that the humour of carping has tranſported you beyond yourſelf, if not beſides yourſelf.

10 FE 60